



Madurai Kamaraj University



(University with potential for Excellence)

Distance Education

M.A.

Political Science

FIRST YEAR

Paper-II

POLITICAL THOUGHT

Recognized by DEC

www.mkudde.org

S150



S 150

DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

**P
O
L
I
T
I
C
A
L

S
C
I
E
N
C
E**

M.A., First Year

Paper- 2

POLITICAL THOUGHT

**MADURAI KAMARAJ UNIVERSITY
PALKALAI NAGAR, MADURAI - 625 021**

ANBA 1 TO 1000

M.A. First Year Political Science

Dear Student,

We have great pleasure in welcoming you to the Post Graduate Course in Political Science. It is likely that you may not be having any background in this subject. So you are advised to read one or two basic books on Political Science so that you will get the necessary insight into the subject.

This paper on Political Thought throws lights on the various aspects of state and government as viewed by different thinkers. You will be studying the Political ideas of 10 thinkers who lived at different times in different places. In addition to these you are also advised to read the recommended text books mentioned in the syllabus.

Besides our guidance in the Conduct Seminar would help you to clear your doubts and provide you with appropriate orientation in the subject.

With Best Wishes,

Department of Political Science

**SYLLABUS
PAPER II
POLITICAL THOUGHT**

Unit : 1	Plato
Unit : 2	Aristotle
Unit : 3	Machiavelli
Unit : 4	Hobbes
Unit : 5	Locke
Unit : 6	Rousseau
Unit : 7	J.S. Mill
Unit : 8	Marx
Unit : 9	Lenin
Unit : 10	Mao

Select References

1. R.N.Berki, The History of Political Thought: A Short Introduction, London, Dent, 1997.
2. J. Coleman, a History of Political Thought; From ancient Greece to Early Christianity, London, Blackwell, 2000.
3. W.Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D.Germino, Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chicago, University of Chicago press, 1972.
5. C.H. mcllwain, The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B.Morall, Political Thought in Medieval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H Sabine, Political Theory, 4th edn., revised by T.L. Thorson, new Delhi, Oxford and IBH, 1973.
8. Q.Skinner, The Foundations Of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

SCHEME OF LESSONS

Lesson No	Content	Page No
1.	Introduction & Political Thought before Plato	4-8
2.	Plato	9-41
3.	Aristotle	42-67
4.	Machiavelli	68-89
5.	Hobbs	90-102
6.	Locke	103-111
7.	Rousseau	112-132
8.	J.S. Mill	133-151
9.	Karl Marx & Lenin	152-175
10.	Mao - Tse - Tung	176-185

Unit – 1

Political Thought before Plato

Introduction

Ever since man started to live in social groups it has been his concern to know about his relation with others. With the formation of the state his focus of enquiry becomes the state. What is that nature of the state? How did the state come into existence? Why should the individual obey the state? What is the limit to its authority? These were some of the questions which perturbed the minds of all those who were concerned with the position of the individual in a politically organized society. Different thinkers who lived in different countries at different times have given their ideas which form the subject matter of political Thought.

Objectives:

- To study the Greece thought
- To study the sophist thought
- To study the Socrates thoughts

Unit Structure:

- Greek thought
- Sophists thought
- Socrates thought
- Summary
- Keywords
- Books for further Reading
- Answer for CYP Questions
- Model Questions

1.1. Greek thought :

Political Thought had its origin in Greece. The Greeks were rational in their approach to problems. The individual was completely integrated with the state. All the individuals exercised their share of powers in the state. Further, the Greek city state was based on law and not on the will of any single individual. It was not a mere union of masters and slaves, but was a fellowship of all men and women. All the citizens worked for common good. The city state witnessed growth and decay. The changes provided material for enquiry. Moreover, the development of various types of city-states in Greece too helped the development of political thought. The variety of their constitutions and their constant contact with each other inevitably suggested comparison and discussion. The individual was compelled to ask questions about the feature of the state, its basis and the obligations of citizens. Greek political thought was predominantly ethical. It did not distinguish between the state and the society. Nor did it make a distinction between religion and the state.

The early Greek thinkers, however, were more concerned with the mystery of the physical universe than ideas. They sought to answer the question 'what is reality?' There were different schools of thought led by philosophers like Thales of Miletus, Pythagoras and Parmenides. The Greek political thought was given a new turn by Sophists. They initiated a sort of intellectual revolution. The meaning of 'Sophist' was Wiseman, although it now indicates someone who is clever and who can make bad reason appear as a good one. They were primarily educators. Their pupils were generally those who hoped to succeed in public life. The Sophists trained their students in rhetoric.

The importance of rhetoric in those days lay in the fact that Athens had a democratic constitution. Its officials had to use rhetoric in justify their actions in the popular assembly.

1.2 Sophists thought:

The Sophists did not belong to any particular school of thought. But their importance lies in the fact that they stood for a new point of vies as against the prevailing interest of philosophy in the discovery of a permanent substratum for physical change. On its positive side, this new point of view was humanism- the twisting of knowledge towards man as its centre. On the negative side, it implied a kind of skepticism towards the ordered ideal of a detached knowledge of the physical world. The Sophists abandoned the study of the physical universe. Man becomes the centre of study. This interest in man continued to dominate the entire Greek though. The Sophists made politics a practical study. As Cicero puts it, they brought philosophy down from Heaven to the dwelling of man.

**Check
Your
Progress
Question**
1. Explain
the Sophist
thought

It was Socrates who changed the direction of political thought completely. He was born in Athens in about 470 B.C. he has been called the god father pf western political philosophy. The starting point of his philosophy was –‘One thing only I know, that is, that I know nothing!’ He maintained that the noblest of all investigation was the study of what man should be and what he should pursue. He raised several questions against certainties and assumptions and wanted accurate definitions, clear thinking and exact analysis. He mainly concerned himself with the meaning of virtue and the nature of the best state.

1.3 Socrates thought :

Socrates taught by the method of question and answer. This method was known as the dialectic. He based his reasoning on facts. According to him, man must be guided by genuine knowledge. Socrates regarded the state as natural. It was the expression of virtue, knowledge and wisdom. The government must promote order and reason. He attacked Athenian democracy because it had destroyed the restraints of morality and religion. The education provided by the Sophists had put power into the hands of the individuals substituting the traditional aristocrats. This resulted in a reckless individualism and disregard for the good of community. Socrates attacked the democratic theory of equality among men and its choice of officials by lot. According to him, the state should be governed not by aristocracy of faith, but by aristocracy of intelligence. He taught the need of expert knowledge, based on first principles for the conduct of political affairs.

1.4 Summary:

Socrates had a unique place in the history of political thought. He was the first thinker to see the implications of intellectual integrity. He raised the question of conflict between political and ethical standard of right. He regarded the state as a natural and necessary from of human association. The laws of the state were next only to the commands of god. The teachings of Socrates made him one of the greatest figures of European civilization.

1.5 Key words:

Greek city, Obligates, Greece city, State, Sophist, Cicero Socrates.

1.6 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, London Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D. Geminio. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chieage, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medieval Times, New York, Harper Torch books, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

1.7 Answer for CYP Questions:

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 1.2

1.8 Model Questions

1. Examine the political thought of Greek before Plato.

Unit – 2

PLATO

(428 B.C - 347 B.C)

Introduction

The chief source of inspiration to Plato was Socrates. His meeting with Socrates was a turning point in his life. It was from Socrates; Plato learnt the dialectical methods of study. It is the Socratic doctrines 'Virtue is Knowledge' and the 'Ideal is the real' that lie at the bottom of Plato's philosophy. The doctrine of dialectics according to Socrates is that, the truth can be reached only as a result of debate or conversation or dialectic and not by examining the things themselves. The teleological notion (Discovering the mind) is the fundamental cause of all the things and hence, the investigation, for Socrates, should have teleological explanation that is, it must centre around a purpose or goal (telos). Socrates also believed that the theory of forms or ideas is fundamental towards the goal of perfection. Plato asked the same basic questions in his inquiries and treated the possible answers more systematically.

Objectives:

- To understand the plato's philosophy.
- To define the plato's idea of the state.
- To understand the plato's concept of individual
- To explain the nature of the three classes by plato.
- To explain the views of plato on education.
- To analyze the plato's theory and conception of Justice.
- To explain the theory of communism by plato.

- To analyse the laws of plato.
- To explain the views of plato on the second best state.

Unit Structure :

- Life History
- Works
- Philosophy
- The Ideal State
- Concept of Individual
- The Three Classes
- The Ideal State
- Criticism
- Plato on Education
- Higher Education
- Plato's Theory of Justice
- Criticism of Platonic Justice
- The Theory of Communism
- Communism in Property
- Criticism
- Communism in Women
- The "Laws" of Plato
- Conception of Justice
- he Second Best State
- Summary
- Keywords :
- Books for further Reading :
- Answer for CYP Questions:
- Model Questions

2.1 Life History

Plato was first the thinker who laid the foundation for political philosophy. He is an incomparable political philosopher. He has influenced very much all the later political philosophers in the world. Even Aristotle who too was a great thinker who was considered as the outcome of Plato. He is the inspiring source of the Intellectual life of the west. Plato's "Republic" and the "Law" are prevailing works in

this field. His thought is based on the conditions and the end line of the then Greek society.

He was born in 427 B.C in a noble family. He was born to Ariston and Perictione one year after the death of Pericles at Athens. His parents belonged to distinguished families. On his mother's side he was related to the first law-giver of Athens, Solon. Plato's father was also brought up in Aristocratic tradition. Plato in his young days came into contact with the great political Philosopher Socrates, who influenced him very much and made him to enter the public life. Some of Plato's relatives and friends also influenced Plato to enter public life. At the same time they wished to make Socrates in famous, which was totally not accepted by Plato. He considered Socrates as a right man. Plato withdraws himself from the evils of his time. When Socrates was given death sentence, Plato was very much taken a back and also he wished to continue the works of Socrates at Megara. Socrates' death turned him from politics to Philosophy. In his early years he had the political ambition, and wished for a career of Statesmanship. It shows that he turned into a Philosopher after Socrates' death. So he joined Euclides at Megara. During 395-86 B.C Plato served in the Corinthian war. Plato had visited Egypt where under Theodor us he studied Geometry. He founded his own school. The Academy at Athens. His concentration was pursuit of truth through education. The purpose of the school was philosophical, academic and political. In total the stress was on scientific studies, but the purpose was essentially ethical. This Academy supplied counselors and law- givers.

Dionysius I was a despot. Plato went to his court, to Syracuse. There, Dionysius had his personal, self-made rule. Plato wished to have a change in that political system, but realized that it was not possible. Fortunately Plato established good relationship with Dion, who was the brother-in-law of Dionysius. Plato advised Dion to develop the qualities necessary for a ruler in an ideal state. So Dion started leading an ideal life. He preferred virtue to pleasure and luxury. Dion advised the ruler to listen to the advice of Plato. The philosopher Plato went on denouncing absolute rule. The dictator treated Plato as a slave. He was saved by one of his friends. This was in 387 B.C... Then in 386 B.C he returned to Athens to found the Academy.

In 367 B.C Dionysius of Syracuse died, his own son who was twenty-eight years old succeeded him. The man was having the vices of woman, wine and song; Dion felt that Plato was the proper man to change Dionysius II into a philosopher king. Unfortunately Plato failed in his mission, because of a number of difficulties, so Plato returned home. But the King made a promise to Plato that he would invite him again. After five years the invitation came to Plato. He came on a mission, but to the surprise of Plato, he was imprisoned in jail in the palace itself. Archytas intervened and released Plato. Plato returned to Athens and died in 347 B.C.

Plato wrote his books in a dialogue form. He designed Socrates as his Chief Speaker. He has given the picture of Political and Philosophical problems found in life. He was a prophet of the light divine. The Apology, The Crito, the Charmides, the Laches and Enthyemes all these center around the life and thought of Socrates.

The political-cum-philosophical books are namely The Republic, The Statesman and the Laws, The Memo, Protagoras and Gorigias. These also center round Socrates but they represented the negative and critical views of the great man. The Republic occupies the central place in the dialogue of Plato. His thought is totally seen in this; the republic is built up on two basic assumptions, one is virtue is knowledge and the second is men are essentially unequal and vary in their capacities for wisdom, courage and appetite. The Republic is the master piece of Plato. This is the center around which all other dialogues are grouped. The dialogues of Plato shows that the political philosophy of Plato involves an interpretation of Greek history and a judgement upon existing institutions.

The tragic end of his mentor Socrates made Plato totally contemptuous of democracy. This event also turned Plato from politics to Philosophy, which culminated in the blending of Ethics and Politics. The Hellenic thought had also influenced Plato to some extent. The idealism and communism of Plato are not totally unrelated to the Hellenic life of his days. In fact a few city states like Sparta and Crete were practising a system of communism and education very close to Plato's description.

The tragic end of his mentor Socrates made Plato totally contemptuous of democracy. This event also turned Plato from politics to Philosophy, which culminated in the blending of Ethics and Politics. The Hellenic thought had also influenced Plato to some extent. The idealism and communism of Plato are not totally unrelated to the Hellenic life of his days. In fact a few city states like Sparta and Crete were practising a system of communism and education very close to Plato's description.

2.2 Works

It is extremely fortunate that the works of Plato have come down to us in full. He wrote in dialogue form, generally representing Socrates as his chief speaker. The dialogues were the artistic presentation of political and philosophical problems found in life.

They were not intended to be exhaustive treaties, but were designed to give flashes of light to enable the reader to understand imaginatively a particular approach.

There is a list of 36 dialogues ascribed to Plato. They were written in different periods of his life and represent different phases in the evolution of his thought. His earliest dialogues include, Euthyphro, Crito, Apology, Charmides, Laches, Lysis, Euthydemus, Protagoras, Gorgias, Meno, Symposium and Phaedo. But the dialogues that brought him name and fame were written during his Academy years. They include the Republic, Phaedrus, Theatetus and Parmenides. During the later years of his life, he wrote the Sophistes, Politicus, Philebus, Timaeus, Critias, the Statesman and the Laws.

2.3 Philosophy

During his life time Plato saw change everywhere. The Greek city-states were so divided that their citizens stood in the state and posture of gladiators against one another. There was injustice everywhere and ignorance was in its zenith. Plato felt that they were not shown the right direction by their leaders, who were ignorant themselves. Man sought peace and happiness in wrong places.

Taking his clue from Socrates, Plato realized that the aim of philosophy is to prescribe the kind of life most likely to promote the happiness of man. Hence the chief aim of Plato became the promotion of justice and virtue. He conjured up a vision of an ideal state where justice and virtue would reign supreme. Virtue is promoted by knowledge and the virtue based on real knowledge according to

Socrates, is permanent. Permanent things do not change with a change in environment and hence they are the perfect things. It was against this background that Plato worked out his doctrine of Forms or ideas. Plato called the permanent character of anything as Form. It is not a thought that exists in the mind, for such a thought is bound to change, it is not part of the world of time and space, it is eternal, it is the final and independent reality. Because it is eternal it must be different from the object in which it appears. The Form of Polis must be different from any particular example of a Polis. At the same time it cannot exist without a Polis. It is a law according to which a Polis functions.

Plato argued that beyond these forms, models and archetypes, there is the Form of all. Form is the idea of good. This idea is the source of all goodness. It is impossible to have definite knowledge of things that are constantly changing. One can have genuine knowledge only of the permanent, of the Form. Men have the hope of escaping their predicament because the good exists. If they can comprehend the Form of the good, they will pass from mere opinion to knowledge, which will draw them to the good.

Plato in his philosophy exhibited a burning and reforming idealism of a poet. The platonic picture of world is an ascent from the 'World of becoming' to one of the 'World of being'. Plato's realization that only by reference to the ideas, one can understand the visible world, enabled him to raise above the mundane world and comprehend the order and beauty with the detachment of a poet-philosopher. Even he himself had warned on many occasions that his thoughts belonged to the world of ideas. He also agreed that the pattern of the Ideal State he has laid down would never be realized on

earth. However, he was undeterred by the consideration of its practicability or exactness and went ahead with his ideas.

Plato in all his dialogues blended Ethics and Politics and thereby gave a definition to Ethics and elevated man's notions of the aims of government and of citizens. Politics to Plato meant Ethics writ large and nothing could justify a code of morality for the state different from that of the individual. There are difficulties in understanding Plato, as he had mixed very many ideas drawn from a wide array of subjects, which is further compounded by the method of speaking through another soul (Socrates). However, for a person who sails along with Plato's reasoning, it is not at all difficult to understand his philosophy. Most of the difficult ideas have been vividly explained by Plato using analogies, drawn from arts and nature, especially from the animal world.

The Republic prescribed an ideal state as an answer for the then existing maladies of the Athenian democratic system. Plato, who was dissatisfied with the treatment accorded to Socrates, constructed an ideal State, where such things would be impossible. It was Plato's conviction that Justice, Order and Harmony could be restored in Greece, only through his ideal State as painted in his Republic.

2.4 The Ideal State

The Socratic Doctrine that the ideal is real gave profound coloring to Plato's philosophy, which led him to the goal of an Ideal State. He believes that only the 'Idea' of things are eternal and final and therefore Real. According to him, there are two worlds. One is the

CYP Question 1. Define a Ideal State

‘World of Being’ and the other is the ‘World of Becoming’. World of Becoming is in a dynamic state, and hence imperfect. It is an actual thing and hence, not Real. But the World of Being is a static one, it is a perfect one and hence it is the ideal world, therefore the Real World. It is only this Ideal State, based on universal and eternal principles which can be perfect. All the actual things keep changing and the goal of such things is to achieve perfection so as to reach the ideal form. Plato in his Republic tries to sketch the model of the best state. He wants to set forth a pattern as to what a state should be. He never bothers to think whether an actual state could live up to his model or not. He himself admits, on many occasions that, “... the city is founded in words; for on earth I imagine it no where exists...”. The practicability of his model is perhaps secondary to Plato.

2.5 Concept of Individual

Plato considers the state as the individual writ large. His theory of state is an organic theory. He compares the state to be a natural body of men, saying that, when a finger is hurt, the whole body feels the pain and that when a member of a state is hurt, all will suffer. According to Plato, in an ideal state the individual is not denied, but fulfilled. The state exists for the perfection of individuals within it the development of the individuals perfects the state. The true greatness of the state is to be measured by the personal work of its citizens. Though Plato builds up an ideal state, it can never be said that he wanted to sacrifice the individual to the state. Plato then proceeds from individuals to the difference among individuals. He divides the human soul into three elements. They are a) Reason b) Spirit and c) Appetite. Actually this doctrine of triplicity of the soul is the

foundation of the Republic. It is interesting to note that Plato prescribes the numerical strength of an ideal state, with ample measure of certainty. He fixes it at 5040 and the reason for providing such a concrete figure is not clearly known. However, he divides this entire community of individuals into three categories according to their endowments and character. Besides, Plato feels that such a division on the basis of the principle of functional specialization, based on diverse capacities for different functions will lead to excellence in achievements.

2.6 The Three Classes

The ‘appetite’ class is the lowest of the three, which is constrained by elements of irrational appetite. He says that this group is governed by their stomach (appetite), this class represents the near entirety of the community except a small percentage which represents the other two classes. This class cuts into a number of sections such as artisans, craftsman and farmers, each with its own special work. According to Plato, this class is unfit to govern and therefore, it can only be governed.

The ‘Spirit’ and the ‘Reasoning’ classes constitute the ruling class, which is just a fraction of the total population. The spirit class is symbolically represented by heart, which denotes the influence of emotion in their actions. This class is called the auxiliary guardians since it helps the guardians to promote justice in the state. This class

CYP Question 2. How to Classify the people
--

represents 'Courage' and thus inspires men and fires enthusiasm for the battlefield. It will courageously raise against injustice and readily submit to justice.

The 'Reasoning' class are the perfect guardians and as such be rulers of the state. This class is symbolically represented by 'brain' and 'wisdom' since reasoning is the sole consideration behind their actions. It consists of the best intellects, who can comprehend both the individual and social goods.

Plato believes in the essential inequality of men and thus builds up a class state. He also believes that irrespective of the class difference, every individual has reasoning capacity', though it differs in degree. This reasoning makes the individuals belonging to different classes to concentrate only in their field where they can be more perfect. Though the three classes have different gradations in virtues, the virtue of justice is common to the three of them.

According to Plato, the state comes out of the character of the men who live there. So he says that the various stages in the development of state are just a reflection of the human mind. Even the emergence of institutions is the product of human mind. Plato begins his discussion from man's appetite. Plato's conception is based on the economic aspect of state. No individual is self-sufficient; he cannot satisfy all his needs by himself. For these needs, he requires the help of others, to satisfy his various needs. They help each other and form together and associate together and constitute the State. This is the primary stage. As the State grows the basic needs of life-food, clothing and shelter. These needs come from different groups of

people from different corner. For example some people may take farming, others may engage in house building.

This concentration of these people is decided on the basis of their innate abilities. This actually helps to produce goods qualitatively better. Plato considers this as the primary economic structure of the state. Further Plato stresses the need and importance of division of labour, in other words functional specialization. So it is realized that Plato begins the construction of state with appetite as the primary basis of the state. Satisfaction of appetite needs common action.

In the next stage Plato talks about the armed forces, to protect the economic structure. Plato was not in favour of people doing the defending work, but here also he emphasizes the functional specialization. As the men in the armed forces should have the greatest amount of skill and practice, and as they are the guardians of the state, they must be free from any other type of occupation. For armed forces men endowed with natural gift must be selected. Some essential qualities must be there for them, like a quick sense to find the enemy, courage to flight against him and so on. They must be fearless, unconquerable and in dominate. At the same time he must be gentle to the people. Armed force must serve as the guide to the king. Thus Plato has given the logical analysis to the whole system on which there is the construction of state.

2.7 The Ideal State

There is a difference between the ideal and the actual. No ideal is actually possible. This is generally applicable to all ideals. So the

question now is why the ideal is sketched. Plato says that the ideal is for the sake of ideal. Plato says that it will serve as a yardstick for human action and human beings may approximate their actions to it.

What is the constitution of the ideal state? Not a mere number of individual. The state consists of individuals by a peculiar bond. Geographical bond or racial bond is not enough. As is seen already it is the economic independence, which comes into existence because of the limited capacity of the individuals to supply his wants. But Plato says that it is not even an economic institution.

The artisan group which comprises craftsmen, farmers and also merchants, all of them carry on the economic activities of the community. They consist of ordinary men and women who are simply concerned with their existence. These people have no interest for truth and ideals; no love for honour. They love only money. They simply wish to secure the means of existence with other classes, they share the virtue of temperance. Temperance is the concord in the classes, which lies in the acceptance of the rule of the higher by the lower.

The persons to be selected as philosopher – rulers have to undergo a series of tests at various stages. The youths of twenty years who have undergone physical and mental training are to be subjected to a test for selection. These selected guardians are given training in advanced courses from the age of twenty to thirty. Further selection is made. The selected guardians are given training in a dialectics and principles of morality from the age of thirty-five to fifty; they are to

gain practical experience of public life in subordinate positions. At the age of fifty there is final selection for the ruler ship.

Plato explains the qualities of the philosopher-ruler. The Philosopher-ruler is one who has passion for wisdom and has a taste for every sort of knowledge which reveals reality. He acquires knowledge with an insatiable curiosity and is an ardent seeker of truth. As he loves truth, he hates falsehood. As he is a seeker of wisdom and truth, he is not a lover of money. He is fair minded, gentle, temperate and social. He has no fear and retains what he learns. His mind is endowed with grace and can see every reality in its true light. He has no fear of death. Thus he is a lover of wisdom, truth, courage, temperance and justice. Education has brought him to such maturity. The republic is to be entrusted to the care of such philosophers.

He moulds the character of others and shapes the pattern of public and private life in accordance with his vision of ideal. In remoulding the character of the people, he is guided by the unchanging model, which determines the outlines and basic principles of his work. The republic achieves the highest objective under the rule of the philosopher.

Reaching his goal is not an easy affair, human reason cannot completely comprehensive context of good. It is difficult to form one contradictory opinion of good. The concept of good is known through premonitions? but at the same time by constant efforts and practice of the powers of the human mind, we can avoid gross errors.

When he says that the guardians should be adequately trained, Plato means they must be surrounded by desirable atmosphere. The guardians should not care for material wealth and then only he can concentrate on the welfare of all. There should not be acquisition of property. The well-being of the group must be the goal. They should not have even a family. Further Plato felt that complete celibacy might result in the lowering of the physical strength and intellectual ability of the guardians. Here Plato suggests temporary marriages for his guardians. Further he insists that men and women should get married or marriage should be performed only when they have attained intellectual and physical maturity. What about the children born out of these temporary marriages? They will be taken care of and reared by the state. The frequency of these marriages will be decided by the state.

In the Ideal State, women are given equal opportunity with men. Women should also be given education like men, so also rights and privileges. As for as rules and regulations of women guardians are concerned they are totally like that of men guardians.

In the ideal state, Plato says the guardians should embrace communism. Plato says that friends should have everything in common including wife and children. Guardians in an ideal state should live under a kind of military monasticism. Guardians must serve the country. Human character according to Plato can be reformed only by compelling men to live a certain kind of life.

Why did Plato compel the best men to surrender to the state? Because, the ideal state requires men to sacrifice his total life for the

community. This is because man is part of the community. According to Plato, true happiness lies in rendering service to the community.

Some argue that Plato brings into existence a kind of caste system in the ideal state. But this is not true. In the caste system birth absolutely determined a man's position. But Plato's system is based on capacity and not on birth.

In the ideal state of Plato, the Philosopher King is the Sovereign. He should not be subject to any limitation. He must have completely freehand in the management of affairs. The government of the ideal state is absolute and totalitarian in character.

2.8 Criticism

Plato is aware of the fact that idea of philosophic statesmanship is most difficult for realization. But Plato approaches it logically. He says that the Philosopher alone knows the highest good and the way to realize it. Democracies of the modern era may reject Plato's own solution to the problem, the rule of a few. Secondly Plato's argument that each element of the mind is a factor in constituting the full state is a dubious one, the dividing of the state into classes can not be accepted. Thirdly Plato says that human soul is a home of contending elements. But mind is not homogeneous. It is heterogeneous in nature. Mind is a residence of various elements. And also there is a continuous struggle for supremacy between spirit and appetite. Only with the interference of reason harmony is established.

Fourthly there is excessive unity in the ideal state because of communism. Again there is excessive separation of classes of persons.

Fifthly under the ideal state there is no court of law, which is the important need of the community, to settle the disputes. Sixthly the great mass of citizens of state is totally neglected. Plato overestimates the intellectual class. He is wrong in assuming that the brightest is the most virtuous. Plato further assumes that limited intellectual deserve no attention. Slavery has no place in the ideal state. The fundamental principles of ideal state nullify it.

Seventhly, the noblest features are regulated by the legislation of the state. The freedom in the selection of wife is abolished, so also permanent marriages of guardians.

2.9 Plato on Education

Plato says that education is a means through which man's abilities are developed and also his character is molded. Education helps a man to discharge specific functions effectively and efficiently. Through education only a new order is laid down. Education helps the individual to adjust to the needs of the Republic. Nothing is holier than knowledge in the world, says Plato. Education according to Plato gives vitality to the soul just as food, air and water provides vitality to body.

CYP Question 3.Mention the idea of Plato on Education
--

The education scheme of Plato consists of two parts

- a) Elementary
- b) Higher

Under the scheme of elementary education there are three stages:

The first stage is the child-hood stage. Up to the age of six, children are given education on simple religious truth and moral character.

The second stage is between six years till the age of eighteen. The learning in this stage is physical and intellectual. Plato prescribes music for the soul and gymnastics for the body.

In the third stage, Plato suggests training in gymnastics including military exercises. Plato says it is to encourage courage, self-control, discipline and character. As we have seen already, at the final stage, the intellectual capacity is tested. Drop outs have no place in the higher education.

2.10 Higher Education

The highly intelligent go for higher education. This is meant only for guardian class. The first period is from 20 years of age to 30 years of age. During this period the learned things are put into reality. At the age of thirty there will be another selection test. In this the dropouts become subordinate officers of the state and auxiliary guardians. Those who get through in this test enter the last stage. They will have a rigorous training of dialectic for a further period of five years. This is at the age of thirty-five. They become guardians and occupy high posts.

Plato starts his scheme of education with the mind, which is active. He says the environment determines the mine. So children should be brought up in proper environment.

Plato says children should not be allowed to listen to fictitious stories because it will make them cowards. The state asks the poets to write good poems for children. The poets must maintain that what the Gods do is just and good. Plato's scheme of education is based on self-control. Plato talks about measures to train the mind and body. Further he stresses the need for physical training to the young mind. Plato discusses the need for maintaining the balance between the mind and the body. All types of training are given to all the guardian up to the age of twenty. According to Plato, Arithmetic, Geometry, solid geometry, and astronomy are the real science giving certain knowledge of unchangeable and external objects and truths. Plato stresses the importance of number. Plato says that those who have taken calculations are naturally quick at learning all other subjects. Arithmetic must be one of the subjects of higher studies. Advanced study of geometry helps the guardians to understand the essential form of goodness. The third branch of study is solid geometry. It helps to train the mind to think abstractly. Plato considers harmonics as the fifth branch of higher study. Dialectic study is another study to secure a connected picture of all the branches of knowledge.

Plato also prescribes the age for each and every stage of study. Plato attaches great importance to the scheme of education. Through education Plato wishes to enter into the ideal state.

But it is not suitable to the modern democratic society. Plato's educational scheme is anti-democratic in nature. Higher education only to the guardian class cannot be accepted. His treatment of maths could not be accepted in total, it is simply an exaggeration.

2.11 Plato's Theory of Justice

Plato's Republic is concerned with two questions. One is the meaning of justice; the second is its realization in human society. Cephalous identifies justice with right conduct. Plato shows that Justice is something internal. Justice exists in the individual and in the State.

What is Justice? Where does it exist? There are several virtues for the well-ordered State. The virtues are wisdom, courage, temperance and justice. Wisdom refers to the fact that the deliberative functions of the state can be done by knowledgeable people. Those who possess wisdom must be the rulers of the state. Only a few persons possess wisdom.

Courageous persons are another class who will take care of the security of the state. But Plato makes distinction between the courage of citizens and courage of a slave, because courage of a slave is blind and irrational. His courage would not be subservient to law.

Self-control or discipline is the third virtue according to Plato. Self-control means that one must be a master of himself. According to Plato the better element must control the worse. The naturally superior can control the naturally inferior. Where self-control exists there is harmony, where there is harmony, there is unity among the different elements that constitute the state.

What is the last virtue? It is Justice. Justice of the State exists when all its citizens occupy their respective positions and perform

their duties and tasks, not meddling with the affairs of others. Justice is the condition for the existence of other virtues.

Justice implies superior character and intelligence while injustice means deficiency in both respects. Therefore just men are superior in character and intelligence and are more effective in action. Further unjust men who are acting together for some unjust purpose are likely to quarrel with one another.

Plato then explains that justice is individual as well as social. First he discusses the individual justice: There is an individual justice when an individual does his work according to his innate abilities. The innate abilities of the individual are divided into three groups- reason, spirit and appetite. An individual is just when each part of his or her soul performs its functions without interfering with those of other elements. For example, reason should rule on behalf of the entire soul with wisdom and fore thought. The element of spirit will subordinate itself to the rule of reason. These two elements (reason and spirit) are brought into harmony by the combination of mental and bodily training. Reasoning is nourished through the study of noble literature. The spirit is trained through physical exercises and by musical harmony and rhythm. Thus reason and spirit are nurtured and trained to understand their true functions. They are set in command over the appetites which form the greater part of man's soul. Therefore reason and spirit have to control these appetites, which are likely to grow on the bodily pleasures. These appetites should not be allowed to enslave the other elements and usurp the dominion to which they have no right. When all three agree that among them then reason alone should rule, there is justice within the individual.

2.12 Criticism of Platonic Justice

Justice of Plato has no legal sanctions behind it. Plato is not able to make a clear distinction between legal and moral obligation. How are we to divide the whole population into three watertight compartments? It is impossible. Platonic justice gives ruling power to only one class, which is called the 'Reasoning Class'. He says, "Philosophers must be kings and kings must be Philosopher". Such concentration of power in one class will have the demoralizing effect. Plato's theory is an ethical code and embodiment of world duties. It is difficult to assess Plato's conception of Justice.

2.13 The Theory of Communism

Plato's communism is a strange communism. It does not affect the economic structure of society. Plato's communism is the result of his conception of justice. Without communism there would be conflict between reason and appetite. Property, family affection and private interest distract man's attention from his duties to the community. This is the basis of Plato's communism.

The union of political and economic power in the hands of one and the same person will be fatal to political purity. This will lead to corruption. Plato felt that communism is the best means by which mind may be reformed. But Plato's communism is half communism. It fails to embrace the third class. The third class lives under normal conditions. The third class is kept under strict supervision so that it may not become too rich or remains too poor.

**CYP
Question**
4. Dissents
the theory
of
communis
m

2.14 Communism in Property

This is the result of his conception of Justice. This communism is strange when compared with modern communism. Modern communism is materialistic in conception. But Plato is the enemy of materialism; the function of the ruler is to guard against it. Platonic communism is negative while modern communism is positive. Platonic communism is applicable only to the guardians and soldiers. Platonic communism is authoritarian service rather than sharing and enjoyment of happiness. So it can be said that it is an antithesis of modern western socialism.

The basis of communism is also philosophical; it is based on the theory of specific functions, which pervades the whole of 'The Republic'. Plato is very much convinced that both wealth and poverty are hindrances in the path of art of government, so both must be kept away. But we have to accept that best born and best educated have only simple and moderate desires, which follow reason and guidance of mind and true opinion.

2.15 Criticism

Plato's communism is subject to variety of criticism, particularly by Aristotle. Those who labour a lot but get little will agitate with those who labour little but consume more. Property as a general rule should be private. The love and pleasure of money is a universal factor. In a communist state there is excessive unification, so liberty to use property as one likes is destroyed. We have to agree with Aristotle that evils will not arise due to property system but due to the wicked nature of human beings.

2.16 Communism in Women

Plato talks about the community of wives. The reason for the abolition of family is several. Plato was talking about the abolition of private property. Without property family cannot be maintained. Guardians of the state should not be distracted by the affection of the family. Absence of family means liberation from bondage. Plato felt that abolition of family would liberate woman. Communism in woman makes possible the breeding of guardians on scientific lines. Where man have common wives there is unity, because of the reason that there is no private pleasure or interest. So Plato felt that communism in women brings unity. The most important factor, which is stressed by Plato, is that communism in women will also regulate the growth of population.

CYP
Question
5. Explain
Plato views
on
communis
m of wives

However high the arguments of Plato on communism of wives is, it has no practical validity. It leads to a number of evils in the society including prostitution. Marriage is something above just procreation. So temporary marriages as advised by Plato cannot be accepted. The last but most important question is what will happen to the parentless child. Children common to all could be neglected by the society.

2.17 The “Laws” of Plato

Even though Plato portrayed an ‘Ideal State’ in his ‘Republic’, in his ‘Law’ he made an attempt to discover a practical form of government. At the age of seventy years he wrote this work. He has changed his views because of his experience in the world. He found it

difficult to create an ideal Republic, but made some changes in ideal state, which has practical validity. With these in mind, Plato started discussion on the concept of the second best state.

The Second Best State differs from the ideal state. The Second best state is a law state, not a wisdom state, Private property and individual family life is given to citizens and the rulers. At the same time Plato felt that it is the best alternative.

What is the basis for a law-state? Plato says, there are two forms of government: one is monarchy and the other is democracy. The Law-giver must blend both together.

Plato wants the state to watch against over-population, and wealth. There should not be much difference between the rich and the poor. If additional wealth is acquired, it must be given to the public treasury. All possessions are to be registered. Gold and silver, dowries and interest and money are forbidden.

In the organization structure 37 guardians are elected. The eligibility is decided, through an elaborate process. The council consists of 360 persons, chosen by citizens. There will be an education minister, who must be above 50 years, and should have children. He is selected from among the 37 guardians, holds office for 5 years. Like the Republic, in Laws also Plato gives importance to education. Laws have both educational and coercive function. There are two parts for the basic laws of a state. One is the Preamble and the other is the Law, pure and simple.

Plato is the first systematic political thinker of the west. He is a great political idealist. Reason rules his state. His state's objective is to achieve and preserve justice. Plato's concept of Justice, education, women equality, rule of reason are universally applicable to the modern society.

2.18 Conception of Justice

The very reason for Plato to construct an ideal state is to promote righteousness or justice in the society. The Platonic conception of Justice is a concept of social ethics, which underscores the basis of social relationship. It lies in the sphere of morality rather than in law. To put it simple, justice for Plato means "Doing one's own duty to perfection". That means, every individual guided by reason will concentrate on their appointed functions. The producing class will produce, and the ruling class will rule, and thereby everyone avoids a conflicting situation. Every individual will try to achieve excellence in his given job. Plato sees in justice, the only remedy against the political and social ills of City – State. For him, the concept of justice is inseparable from the Ideal State. In short, Plato's idea of justice is a theory of ethical code, which demands, organic unity in the state arising out of a harmonious balancing of functions.

To sum up, the most salient features of Plato's Ideal State are:

- 1) The classification of citizens on the basis of their endowments, capacities and vocational specialization, namely, the guardians, the auxiliary guardians and the producing class corresponding to wisdom , courage and appetite.

- 2) The abolition of the private property and family life for the both the guardian classes so as to get the best out of them for the state.
- 3) The promotion of state controlled education for the emancipation of both men and women, through various stages and for the constant supply of philosopher kings for the governance of the state.
- 4) The governance of the state to be permanently vested with philosopher kings, who are to be produced by a rigorous educational system and not by any hereditary consideration.
- 5) The conception of justice is to reign supreme in the Ideal State.
- 6) Philosophers must be kings and kings must be Philosophers.

Plato's ideal state is often criticized as Utopia and impracticable. Plato himself has acknowledged that such a system can never be seen on the earth, but he never doubted its practicability. In fact, this ideal at least partly is based on the conditions that actually existed in ancient Greece. He has depicted and borrowed the institutions in Sparta, Crete, and other city states. Elements of communism and a system of education, very close to the Platonic scheme were seen in those city-states.

Again, Plato himself is not bothered about the practicability or otherwise of his ideal state. His main consideration is to move towards

the perfect state where alone justice would reign supreme. He creates the necessary conditions for such a state in his Republic.

Plato's ideal state represents an absolute totalitarian system. He has classified the human society into three stereotyped classes so as to create social unity and harmony. Such a rigidity is unwarranted. There would be too much collectivism, where the individual will not have fuller freedom to develop all their faculties. He has built up an ideal state on the basis of functional specialization which tends to dwarf the personality by condemning an individual to just one particular function for all the time to come.

The philosopher kings have been assigned absolute powers, and the entire governance of the state has been left to the insight and knowledge of the guardians. There is almost complete absence of laws in the Ideal State.

Plato has also totally ignored human nature by prescribing total communism for the guardian class. In such a system, the guardians may not have the motivation to work hard in the absence of incentives. His system of common family is unworkable and unrealistic.

Plato's educational scheme denied higher education to the producing class which is left without any means to develop their personalities.

He has also totally denied them a role in the governance of the state, and they constitute the near entirety! They are reduced to the

status of producers of consumer goods and no way has been prescribed for their emancipation.

It can be said in defence of Plato that his Ideal State represents a useful pattern though very difficult to practice. As Janet has put it: Plato's Ideal State is both an Utopia and ideal. It is Utopian to divide the society arbitrarily, abolish property and family, and assign absolute powers to the rulers. But it not Utopian to asses that justice consists in the concord and harmony of citizens, that the true strength of a state is virtue, that the source of virtue is education and that the destiny of the state should be in the hands of the virtuous and the wise. The Utopian part in Plato is unreal, imaginative, arbitrary, impracticable and already dead. But the ideal in him represents an attempt to present an ideal of a true model state which is eternal.

2.19 He Second Best State

While Plato portrays an ideal state in his Republic, he attempts to discover a practical form of government, even if it is a little distorted, in his last work "The Laws". This was written by Plato when he was about seventy, in which he shows a maturity of judgement which gives rise to practical wisdom. Thirty years of association in the Academy and other worldly experience forced him to modify his view about many things.

Plato holds that "the Form of Polis is laid up in heaven" and "the city is founded in words, for on earth I imagine, it nowhere exists". As he realized the difficulties in creating his Republic, he suggests certain changes so as to make it very close to the ideal model, and above all practicable. With this in mind, he turns his

discussion to his conception of the Less Distorted State or the Second Best State.

The second best state lies in between the form or ideas of the polis and actual or historical states. It differs basically from the ideal state in two Law - State respects: First, it is a law state and not a wisdom-state; and second, its citizens including, the rulers, have private property and individual family life. Plato argues that "it is very difficult to find statesman of highest calibre in the mixed situations of human history, even if we find them, they tend to be corrupted by political power. Hence we must accept a system of laws"

Such a law-state, for Plato, will inevitably do injustice to individuals and groups, as it often creates certain situations that cannot be reconciled with righteousness. Yet, it is the best alternative to giving absolute powers to men who do not have wisdom. In the commonwealth of laws, he states, the communism of property, women and children must also be abandoned.

2.20 Summary :

After reviewing the history of political society, Plato sketches out the basis for a law-state. According to him, basically there are two forms of government: monarchy and democracy. The law giver must blend the two in such a way that men can combine their tendency to be free of restrictions with some recognition of the limitations placed by wisdom. Plato gives some details about regulations essential to preserve a measure of harmony and justice. He suggests that laws must be prolific where public and private interests are likely to clash.

According to Plato, laws have both educational and coercive functions. They are educational because they instruct good men so that "they may live on friendly terms with one another.... They are coercive because "they compel those who refuse to be instructed from plunging into evil". The basic laws of a state for Plato shall have two parts: One is the 'Preamble' and the other is the 'Law pure and simple'. The preamble must explain the purposes of legislation, its relations to reason and social justification. The 'law pure and simple' is to be the command that restrains the irrational. Plato hopes that, if greater skill is used in drafting the preamble, the law will be accepted through reason alone.

However, Plato introduces an element of wisdom into his law state, somewhat inconsistently. When he establishes the Nocturnal Council Plato is not very clear about the constitution and functions of the council. But he surely gives the council the powers to suspend laws in the name of wisdom. He allows legal revisions according to the changes in time and environment.

Though Plato advocates a law-state; still he does not make any compromise with his quest for justice. For him the ideal state is always the best. Since there are certain practical difficulties in establishing such a state, he advocates a model very close to the ideal state. Even his law state has certain pitfalls. He even contradicts the notion of the law-state in the name of wisdom, by creating a 'Nocturnal council', which could easily become a body of semi-tyrants.

To sum up, it can be said that Plato is not a 'Visionary, but a original thinker, who makes idealism to guide realism. He produces an idea of state (which is termed as an ideal state) to serve as the model to assess the existing institutions. The Republic is a vision of good and the Laws continue to aim at the goodness, although the path towards goodness has been redefined in the latter.

To sum up, it can be said that Plato is not a “Visionary, but a original thinker, who makes idealism to guide realism. He produces an idea of state (which is termed as an ideal state) to serve as the model to assess the existing institution. The Republic is a vision of good and the Laws continues to aim at the goodness, although the path towards goodness has been redefined in the letter.

2.21 Keywords :

Philosopher, Idealism, Virtue, Republic, Doctrine, Opposite, slavery, Justice, Governance.

2.22 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, London Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D. Gemino. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chieage, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.

6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medical Times, New York, Harper Torch books, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

2.23 Answer for CYP Questions:

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 2.4

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 2.6

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 2.9

Question No.4 – Refer Paragraph No. 2.13

Question No.5 - Refer Paragraph No. 2.16

2.24 Model Questions

1. State and examine Plato's theory of communism.
2. "Plato's Republic is the best treatise ever written on education" – Discuss.
3. Attempt a comparison on the nature of state in Plato's Republic and the Laws.

ARISTOTLE
(304 B.C - 322 B.C)

Introduction

Aristotle enjoys an enviable place in Political thought. Aristotle was born in 384 B.C. at Stagria, a small colonial town, on the border of the kingdom of Macedonica. His father was Nichomachus. He was a court physician to Philip, the father of Alexander the Great. His Father's treatment of diseases, case records, remedial treatment of diseases, case records, remedial treatment and so on has attracted young Aristotle. This only influenced Aristotle to use scientific methods in the study of Politics. He is comparable to a biologist, because like a biologist he classified the constitutions and like a medical man he suggested remedies to prevent revolutions in various constitutions.

Aristotle's life can be divided into three stages. The first stage was the period of learning at Athens from 367 to 347. The Second stage was from 347 to 335, which was spent by Aristotle in Journey. The final stage from 335 to 322 B.C., was devoted to teaching. Aristotle established his own school in 335 B.C.

Objective:

- To study the Aristotle views on state
- To define the slavery by Aristotle.
- To understand the ideas on justice.
- The explain the caused for revolution by Aristotle.

Unit Structure

Aristotle on State

Citizenship

Rights of Citizens

Aristotle on Slavery

Criticisms of Aristotle's Slavery

Classification of Constitutions

Ideas on law

Ideas on Property

Ideas on Justice

Aristotle on Revolution: Causes for Revolution

Particular causes of Revolution

The following are the factors responsible for revolution in tyranny

The following are some of the causes responsible for revolution in democracy

General Remedies to Prevent Revolution

The Best State of Aristotle

Plato and Aristotle

Ideal State

Summary:

Key words:

Answers for CYP Question

Books for further Reading

Model questions

3.1 Aristotle on State

Aristotle says that the state came into existence as a result of those who can not exist without each other. In this association the family is the first emergence. Family cannot exist without sustenance. The family consisted of husband, wife and slave. The family according to Aristotle is a natural association brought into existence for the satisfaction of the material needs of man. So long as the family is satisfied, they remained independent. When the needs of the family is increased, for the satisfaction of their needs the union of the family becomes necessary. This led to the formation of a village.

This is the first society. These several villages united together into a state. Originating in the barest needs of life, the state continues for the sake of good life.

It shows that the state is not a mere mechanical aggregation of families or the villages. Aristotle says that state is prior to the individual. It is very true that he is prior to the state in terms of time. But the state is prior to him in order of thought and reality. The state is the end and the end is generally prior to every thing else. The state according to Aristotle is the real organization and the relationship between its different parts is organic.

The state is a natural institution. The end of the state is good life and not mere life. If life is the only object, slaves and brute animals may form the state, but they cannot. State exists for the purposed of protection of life and property of the individual and for the exchange of goods. It makes the individual self – sufficient.

Aristotle's state is a positive one. According to Aristotle a state, which does not concern itself with the good of the individual, is not a true state. The state will promote the good of the individual through education. It is the principal function of the state and the object of education is the training of citizens in goodness. The material condition is necessary for the existence of a state. Every state must have sufficient population, but it must not be large. The size of the state must be limited. It should not be too large or too small. In a state if it is limited in size there will be intimacy between the ruled and the ruler.

3.2 Citizenship

Aristotle says that a citizen is not the one who resided in a particular place. Because if it is insisted themselves and for equal will automatically become citizens. So also Aristotle says that only those who are having legal rights are citizens. And also Children and the young are not citizens in the absolute sense.

**CYP
Question**
1. Define
Citizensh
ip

Then who are citizens? According to Aristotle one who has a share in the administration of justice and the right to hold office for any period is a citizen. Even those who had acquired constitutional right to administer after the resolution have the right to citizenship. The citizen must perform different functions for the protection of the community. Another virtue of the citizen is that every citizen must know how to rule and be ruled. Explaining the difference between a citizen and a ruler, Aristotle says that practical wisdom is the distinct character of the ruler and the citizen.

3.3 Rights of Citizens

Every citizen should have the right to hold office. In this aspect Plato and Aristotle differ. Plato believes in scientific knowledge whereas Aristotle believes in practical knowledge. And another view of Aristotle is equal treatment must be given to citizens who are equal in virtue.

3.4 Aristotle on Slavery

Aristotle recognizes Slaves. Who is a slave? Any one who by nature is not his own man but another's is a slave. A man who has no personality of his own, or a mind of his own is a slave. According to Aristotle every house has number of institutes both animate and inanimate, for the management of its household affairs. In this the animate instrument is the slave.

Aristotle says that slavery is necessary. A citizen cannot develop his personality and engage himself in activities unless he is assisted by the physical strength of the slaves, in combination with his intelligence for development.

Some slaves are also capable, having the same capacity as his master. The enslavement of these types of men is not accepted by Aristotle. But there are men who do not have the capacity. They are not capable of performing other than menial functions. They are benefited because of remaining under a master.

Slavery was a natural institution. He justified the principle of subordination and rule by the superior over the inferior. By virtue of the principle, the soul should rule the body with the same authority of a statesman. It is clearly beneficial and natural to the body that it should be ruled by the soul. It is clear from Aristotle that all human beings who have no capacity for development are by nature slaves. At the same time Aristotle says that slaves can be made use of only

one purpose that is to provide leisure to the master and not for acquiring more wealth, power and comfort. Slavery is not justified in this angle.

3.5 Criticisms of Aristotle's Slavery

The first assumption of Aristotle that some are not capable of developing their personality is unbelievable. The classification of individuals on the basis of capacity is an impossible task. The rationalization of the institution of slavery by Aristotle is regrettable. It brings out the narrow out look of Aristotle. In fact, Aristotle rejected the historical origin of slavery but provides as philosophical realization and justification of the institution. Slavery can not be accepted because it is against the principles of equality and liberty.

3.6 Classification of Constitutions

Aristotle defines a Constitution as the scheme or plan according to which the government is carried on. He has analyzed 158 constitutions. It is this analysis that has provided the raw material for the generalization of his political theory.

The constitution reflects the character of the people. It determines the social ethics of the community and moulds its economic order. In short, it is the way of life of the citizens. Hence a change of constitution meant not merely a change in the government but also a reversal of the ethical, social and economic standards of the people.

CYP Question 2. Explain the various types of constitution
--

Aristotle divides the constitutions into two main groups according to their end or object. When their government promotes respect of law and order and seeks to attain the good life of the people, it is good or normal. When a government pursues the narrow interest of the ruler it is corrupt or perverted. One may ask whether a perverted constitution does not fall short of an ideal state. Aristotle replies that no constitution fully secures the common good.

Within each of these two main divisions there are three kinds of government based on the fact whether the supreme power was vested in one individual or in a few or in many. If one person rules for the good of all, he calls that form of rule as Monarchy. It becomes tyranny, when it secures only the interest of the individual ruler. Government of the few is Aristocracy when it secures the common good. Aristocracy become oligarchy when it looks after the ruling few. Control of the state by many is called polity. Thus Monarchy, Aristocracy and Polity are the normal forms of government and Tyranny, Oligarchy and Democracy are the perverted forms of government.

Aristotle thinks that Democracy is the least bad of the perverted forms, just as Tyranny is the worst of the three. He argues that the many when they meet together may very likely be better than the few good, if regarded not individually but collectively, "just as a feast to which many contribute is better than a dinner provided out of a single purse". When the total virtues and experience of the many are

brought together in the assembly the result is likely to be greater than the goodness of a single individual or of a small group.

For Aristotle, Polity is the best form of government but it is not the ideal because it does not secure the rule of perfect virtue. It is democratic because the will of the majority prevails. It is aristocratic to the extent that officers are secured by ability. It is good because it avoids the unruly rich and the ignorant poor. The middle classes neither desire the wealth of the rich nor are they envied by the poor. They create a stable government based on friendship, equality and justice.

3.7 Ideas on law

Aristotle attaches great sanctity to the laws of society. He interprets law as a restraining force on the community. It is the regulating force that determines the course of action for individuals. Aristotle defines laws as the sum of all the spiritual limits under which man's actions must proceed. "The greatest spiritual limitations on man's action are exercised by passionless reason. Therefore, law is dispassionate reason". Aristotle prefers the rule of law to the rule of men. The magistrates should regulate only matters on which the law is silent.

**CYP
Question**
3 Explain
Aristotle
ideas on
law

Since the state exercises its aim and purpose through the instrumentality of law, the aim and purpose of the state and law are identical. The highest purpose of the state is to promote good life. Therefore, the aim of law is to promote moral and spiritual good. The law is sovereign because there is no power supreme over it.

3.8 Ideas on Property

According to Aristotle, property is of two kinds: (i) Inanimate and (ii) Animate property (may be either private or local). Private property must be protected by the state. Otherwise somebody else will take possession of it. For the existence and proper functioning of the household private property is necessary. The things which are necessary for life such as food, clothing and shelter constitute property. The instinct for requiring property in man is natural. But the amount of property required by the family is limited by its needs. To have in excess is as bad as to have less than what is required.

CYP Question. 4. Define Property

3.9 Ideas on Justice

Justice is complete virtue – “not absolutely, but in relation to our neighbor”. The social character of virtue is universal justice or lawfulness. Thus universal justice is reflected in particular justice which is divided into two kinds viz., distributive justice and remedial justice.

Distributive justice means that offices and wealth ought to be distributed in accordance with the merits of the person. What is merit? Aristotle points out that definitions of merit vary in accordance with the spirit of the constitution. Thus, in an oligarchy merit is graded in accordance with wealth, and in aristocracy, it is measured in relationship to virtue. Aristotle maintains that in a true polis, the standard of merit for distributive justice is virtue. Men with greatest virtue would hold the important offices while those with lesser degrees of virtue would be given the lower posts. The same

principle would apply in the distribution of other honours and wealth too, for, the virtuous soul can be expected to keep both economic goods and the goods of honour in a subordinate position.

Remedial or rectification justice is meted out by the Judge. In matters of contracts or criminal law, we ought not to ask what the merits of a person may be but rather treat all persons as if they were of equal merit. Aristotle suggests yet another sense in which justice can be used. The exchange of goods and the pressure of supply and demand work out a kind of rough justice in the commercial realm. In this sense justice is not a virtue but a type of stabilizer.

Aristotle divides justice into two, what is lawful and what is fair and equal. The first one is universal justice, whereas the second is particular justice. Universal Justice is equivalent to obedience to law. It is coterminous with virtue. Particular justice is divided into distributive justice and remedial justice.

Distributive justice means that the state divides goods among its citizens, according to merit. Whereas remedial justice is divided into two, based on civil law and criminal law. Aristotle adds commercial and cumulative justice. Aristotle says that good in the sphere of politics is justice. According to Aristotle Justice means the just distribution of offices.

3.10 Aristotle on Revolution: Causes for Revolution

Aristotle classified the causes for revolution into two

1. General
2. Particular

Let us analyze the general causes for revolution. The first cause is the different interpretations of the principle of justice and equality. The main cause of revolution is the passion for equality. Equals want to become superior.

Secondly revolutionary coordination comes into existence when some suffer dishonor or when they see others honoured.

Thirdly if a person (or body of persons) occupies a position of strength, which is too great for the state, revolution comes into existence.

Fourthly fear promotes sedition. Wrong – doers who are afraid of punishment and persons who are likely to suffer a wrong doing may promote sedition.

Fifthly contempt is also a cause of revolution. In oligarchies the workers hate the wealthier classes.

Sixthly disproportionate growth of a state is another cause for revolution.

Seventhly election intrigues are sometimes responsible for the revolutionary conditions. Heterogeneity among the people may lead to disturbance and revolution. Because heterogeneity may promote sectional feelings and thereby disrupt the country.

The special causes of revolution: The pattern of government is responsible for revolution. If there is an oppressive treatment of the masses it may lead to the outbreak of revolution.

Aristotle first discusses the general causes of revolution, which are responsible for constitutional changes. Different interpretations of justice and equality lead to different claims and counter-claims by different groups.

Sedition is caused when justice and equality are differently interpreted by different groups. Sedition may lead to constitutional changes in two ways:

Sedition may be directed against the existing constitution. Seditionists may try to convert democracy into oligarchy or vice versa.

Sedition may be directed for some changes in to existing constitution.

A seditious group may desire to retain the existing constitution but wants the administration into the hands of its own members.

It may desire perfection in the existing constitution. For example, it may desire to make a democracy a perfect democracy or an oligarchy a perfect oligarchy.,

It may desire a partial change in the existing constitution.

The next general cause of revolution is the state of mind. The main causes, which stir up the mind of the people, are the conceptions of justice and equality. Some people revolt because their minds are influenced by a desire for equality. They think that though they are equal to those who have got the advantage over them, they have the worst of the bargain. There are some whose minds are dominated by a passion for superiority. These men think that they do not get any advantage over other people although they are superior to others. Thus the inferior people want to be equal and equals wish to be superiors.

Another general cause of revolution relates to the objects at stake. The objects at stake are profit and honour. People revolting against the government may be trying to avoid disgrace or a fine befalling them.

The last general cause of revolution pertains to the initial occasions. Aristotle gives a brief account of these initial occasions for revolution: When persons in office show insolence and seek personal benefits, the citizens revolt against the men in power. Men resent when they are dishonored while others are honored.

Superiority in any form may lead to sedition in the state.

Fear between two groups of persons may lead to sedition. Persons expecting punishment or danger from another may make use of an occasion to revolt.

Contempt is another occasion for disturbance in the state. Numerous people who do not enjoy political rights have contempt's for the minority group, which enjoys political rights and other advantages in the oligarchic state. In democracy the wealthy that hate disorder and anarchy resent the existing system.

The disproportionate increase in any element of the state may result in constitutional changes.

The disproportionate increase in the number of common people results in the establishment of democracy. Democracy may be changed to oligarchy if there is an increase in the number of rich people and their properties.

If small changes are not set right in time, the whole constitutional structure may collapse at a later stage. Willful negligence also leads to changes in the constitution.

Election intrigues may cause constitutional changes without actual sedition.

When persons not committed to the spirit of the constitutions are allowed to hold magistracies, the constitution may be twisted.

Dissimilarity in the social composition also leads to heterogeneity and results in social disturbance, which leads to change in the political structure of the state.

Heterogeneity of the territory of the state is also a cause for sedition and insurrection, if the territories are not cemented by political unity; one of the reasons may revolt against the state.

The growth in reputation or power of the magistracies or some elements of the state leads to a change in the constitutional structure of the state. The additional power that disturbs the balance in the body politic may come from a person or a body of magistrates or a tribe or a group. The persons who acquire additional power may not like to remain on a footing of equality with others. They feel that they are superior and want greater advantages or power in the state. It also happens that sedition may be started by those persons who envy the honours of others and demand additional powers for themselves.

In the absence of a stable middle class as a balancing force the two opposing classes – the rich and the poor may struggle for power. If one of them is stronger, that alone prevails.

A constitution is changed from within as well as from without. The Constitution is changed from outside when it is confronted by a constitution of an opposite type.

3.11 Particular causes of Revolution

Aristotle's explanation of the general causes of revolution is followed by an analysis of the particular causes of revolution. The following are the causes of revolution in kingship:

Unjust oppression, fear and contempt are the reasons for sedition. The king enjoys pre-eminence of wealth and honour, which are also the objects of desire of the people. Therefore, the people may attack the office of the king, which provides wealth and honour to him. Further, attacks provoked by insults are directed against his person. The king may be attacked from a feeling of contempt also. Friends of the king may attack him because they despise him. Out of contempt they may seize power. Persons who feel that they are strong and competent to manage the affairs of the government may attack the king and seize power. This, according to Aristotle, is the reason why the generals attack their king.

Sedition is also due to the craze for fame. Men are moved by ambition though such men may be few.

Dissension among members of the royal family will also lead to sedition.

If a king claims a large prerogative without any legal restriction, people do not tolerate such measure.

A king ceases to be a king when his subjects cease to be willing subjects, whereas a tyrant continues to be a tyrant whether his subjects are willing to obey him or not.

**CYP
Question**
5. What is
particular
causes of
Revolution

Revolution takes place in Polity due to the following reasons:

Downfall of polity is also due to deviation from constitutional justice.

The cause of failure in polity is due to inability to balance the different elements in the state, which are the upper, middle and lower classes.

3.12 The following are the factors responsible for revolution in tyranny

The nobles who are harassed by the tyrant may plan to overthrow him. They want to be rulers themselves and do not want to be slaves under the tyrant.

Unjust oppression, contempt, insult and confiscation of property of the people by the tyrant will lead to sedition.

A tyrant may be overthrown by another state with an opposite form of constitution; conflict between the opposite political systems will cause sedition in both tyranny and other forms of government.

The partners in the tyrannical government may quarrel among themselves and thus cause political instability. Hatred and contempt are also important causes of attack against the tyrant.

Aristotle lists the causes of revolution in oligarchy. According to him the following are the cause responsible for change in the oligarchy:

The first cause is the unjust treatment of the masses by the oligarchic government. A leader who comes from the governing class is a competent champion to lead the masses against the government of his class. Further the wealthy men who are excluded from the offices may lead the movement of resistance. These men who do not find opportunities to participate in the affairs of the government continue to create disturbances until they are given some share in the government.

Another main cause for sedition in oligarchy is dissension within the ruling class.

3.13 The following are some of the causes responsible for revolution in democracy

In democracy the changes are also due to the indiscriminate attack by the demagogues on the rich.

Democracy may undergo certain changes from the traditional form to the modern form. Qualifications for voting right may change with the changing conditions. The legislative power of the popular assemble may undergo certain changes.

3.14 General Remedies to Prevent Revolution

The analysis of the causes of revolution helps to understand the remedies, which ensure the preservation of the constitutions. Aristotle

first enumerates the general remedies to prevent revolution in any form of constitution.

If the initial and merge causes of future lawlessness are not curbed in time, they will become unmanageable in future and destroy the constitutional structure. Therefore, precautions should be taken against the lawlessness and especially against its petty forms.

No reliance should be placed on the measures meant to hoodwink the masses because such measures will be exposed in the long run.

Whenever there is danger to any constitutional system, people try to keep a firmer grip on their constitution. Therefore the defenders of the Constitutional system should foster alarms, which will keep men on their Guard. People under such conditions are like watchmen on night duty. Thus a feeling of emergency helps to maintain the government.

If the members of the governing class are numerous in any state, democratic institutions should be introduced. Further it is advisable to restrict the tenure of office to a shorter period in order to enable men enjoy their turn.

There should be law to prevent the notables from quarrels and seditions.

A state should not promote a person out of all proportion. It is wise policy to give small honours over a period of time than to award all honours at a time.

A watch should be kept over a group, which is flourishing. To prevent such a group from capturing or monopolizing the powers of the state, Aristotle suggests two measures:

The conduct of affairs of the state and the enjoyment of offices should be given to the opposition group.

The strength of the middle class should be increased. The middle class may maintain balance between the rich and the poor.

The magistrates should not be allowed to use their office for personal advantages.

If any constitution is to remain stable, three qualities are necessary for the holders of office and the constitution.

The persons who exercise sovereign power of the state should have loyalty to the established constitution.

These men must have adequate capacity to discharge the functions of the offices.

There should be harmony between the quality of goodness and justice, and the nature of a constitution.

Political issues should not be pushed to an extreme. If democracy and oligarchy are pushed to an extreme, they cease to be constitutions. If people are to reconcile themselves to a constitution, they must live in accordance with the spirit of the constitution. People who do not live democratically in democracy will revolt against the democratic constitution. Therefore, magistracy is instituted to watch over those people who do not live in harmony with the established constitution. The citizens should be educated to live and act in the spirit of the constitution.

3.15 The Best State of Aristotle

Aristotle argues that the best state is decided under actual circumstances. A constitution cannot be the best at all circumstances for all the citizens. The best constitution must remain for a long time. According to Aristotle, Democracy is the best where more poor people have a role to play and where poor people exceed the rich. Oligarchy is suitable where the rich are superior in power and richness. Where the middle class is superior to all the rest it is politics. The above analysis, Aristotle shows that the best type depends on the circumstances. Aristotle's description of an ideal state resembles the features of the Polis of Plato. The aim of Aristotle was to present the desirable features of Polis. He employed the doctrine of the means. The State must be self sufficient with regard to population and territory. Population should not exceed a limit. Abortions are allowed if there are too many children. Women will occupy a subsidiary position. The city must be near the seashore, which will be helpful for the promotion of trade and commerce. The citizen must

own the land, should perform the functions of warriors, priests and administrators at successive stages of life.

Like Plato, Aristotle also gave importance to education. He felt that to develop the ideal character of the citizens, education is necessary. Education will develop moral and intellectual excellence. So Aristotle stressed compulsory public education as the best essential for the best state. Education must be given from the age of seven, which will be a suitable age to start learning.

3.16 Plato and Aristotle

Aristotle's philosophy has been described as Platonism minus the ideal. Aristotle complains that Plato's ideas have nothing to do with practical life.

Plato's philosophy is a philosophy of withdrawal from the world of common experience. The eyes and ears are not the windows of the soul, they opening upon reality. The native bent of Aristotle's mind was in the other directions, towards the study of empirical facts.

Aristotle wanted definite and scientific knowledge. Plato has no belief for facts. He had no gift for physical enquiries. Plato had a sort of contempt for the world of senses, which is a world of facts.

Plato's communism was criticized by Aristotle. Plato and Aristotle both like to establish unity and harmony in the state, but by different means. Aristotle says that spiritual medicine is required for spiritual evils.

The abolition of family and property would not achieve the end, these two date back to much earlier era.

The concept of philosopher king too was not agreeable to Aristotle. Aristotle makes a distinction between theoretical and practical wisdom.

3.17 Ideal State

Aristotle discusses the best State. He declares that we must consider not only the absolutely best form but what is the best attainable by men and what is the best under given circumstances.

In the Ideal State the best must rule. Extremes of wealth and poverty are the main sources of evil. The former brings arrogance and a lack of capacity to obey, the latter brings slavishness and a lack of capacity to command. There can be no real State if people are divided into the two classes of very rich and very poor, because friendship, which is the essential principle of all association cannot exist between the classes. Therefore, the best state is one in which the middle class is stronger than the other two classes.

Polity, however, is not necessarily the best constitution for all people and under all circumstances. Aristotle holds the circumstances may make any form the best. That Constitution which remains stable for long is the best.

3.18 Summary:

Aristotle's description of an Ideal State strongly suggests that of Plato in the Laws. The aim is to present the desirable features of a Polis, without exceeding the limits of the possible. Hence he always employs the doctrine of the mean. The population and territory of the state must be sufficiently great to make the state self sufficiency. But the number of people must not exceed the limit up to which it can be well supervised. As was in vogue in Athens and Sparta, deformed children will be exposed to die, couples with too many children will be encouraged to have abortions. Women will occupy a subsidiary position. The city should be situated near enough to the sea to import goods from abroad, but not so near, as to unduly promote commerce and the seafaring class. The citizens must own the land, and should perform the functions of warriors, administrators and priests at successive stage of life. Supported by the produce of their land, they will enjoy leisure which is essential for true virtue.

Aristotle stressed the importance of education as the means to develop the ideal character of the citizens. The perfections of the State depends upon the perfection of its members which can be achieved only through the cultivation of moral and intellectual excellence. Therefore, a system of uniform, compulsory public education is the first essential of the best State, and the administration of the education system is the most important function of government. Aristotle's project of education aims at mental culture rather than practical utility. It lays emphasis on physical training and attaches moral significance and a character making influence to music. Education is to begin in the case of each citizen at the age of seven. The primary purpose of education is to prepare the citizen for leisure.

The obligation of ruling and the equally great responsibility for pursuing the arts and sciences go with this leisure.

3.19 Key words:

Citizen, Right, Slavery, Constitutions, Law, equality, Justice, Revolution, Ideal State, Property.

3.20 Answers for CYP Question :

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 3.2

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 3.6

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 3.7

Question No.4 – Refer Paragraph No. 3.8

Question No.5 - Refer Paragraph No. 3.11

3.21 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, London Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D. Geminio. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chicago, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medieval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.

8. Q. Skinner. **The Foundations of Modern Political Thought; 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.**

3.22 Model questions

1. **Examine Aristotle's ideas on State.**
2. **Analyze Aristotle's justification of slavery.**
3. **Discuss Aristotle's criticism of Plato.**
4. **Analyze causes for Revolution**

NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI

(1459 - 1527)

Introduction :

Machiavelli was born in 1469 in a family of papal supporters. Very little is known about his early life and education. In 1498 he was appointed as Secretary to the City Council of Naples. Later he became Secretary to the Council of Ten in charge of military affairs. Machiavelli was a friend of the Sodering family, which sought to reestablish popular rule after the aristocratic government of the Medici and administration of the extremist Friar Fra Cirolama Savonarola. His association with the family led to his appointment as envoy for Florence in many external negotiations.

The Soderini were overthrown by the Medici in 1512, aristocracy was restored. Because of his close connection with the Soderini. Machiavelli was dismissed from his post on the ground that he had been friendly to the Medici. He died in the same year.

Objectives:

- To example the political ideas of Machiavelli
- The study the forms of government according to Machiavelli
- To understand the concept of preservation of the state.
- The study Machiavelli concept of Religion and morality.

To understand Machiavelli's principle for prince.

Unit of Structure

- Method
- Political Ideals of Machiavelli,
- Politics and Morality
- Political Motives
- Forms of Government
- Preservation of the State
- Extension of dominion
- Machiavelli's concept of Religion
- The Prince
- Machiavelli's Principle for Prince
- A Meager conception of State
- Summary
- Key words
- Answer for CYP Question
- Books for further Reading
- Model Question

4.1 Method

Machiavelli regards the historical method as the true method of political science. He believed that throughout history people at all place had been influenced by the same motives and had the same problems, which they solved with the same means. Therefore a study of the past would throw the fullest light on the needs of the present and would even make prediction of the future possible. Machiavelli wanted to show the relation of history to politics while trying to enter upon a new and untried path in political speculation. He relied heavily on the history of Greece and Rome, particularly the latter. The medieval scholastic philosophy had taught that the contributions of the pagans to the development of mankind was practically worthless. But Machiavelli took the other extreme view that the

Greeks and Romans alone played a significant part in the development of the human race. He ignored the role played by Christianity.

Machiavelli's new method was applied in his works. The Discourses dealt with the Romans almost exclusively. In The Prince his interest was clearly determined by contemporary conditions. He employed the comparative method, which is essential to the historical only to a slight extent. Dunning points out that Machiavelli's method was historical, rather in appearance than in reality. He was actually interested in the men and conditions of his own time. In the history of the ancient he found parallels to existing conditions. He was a keen observer of his own times. His analysis of the events determined his method. His conclusions were reached empirically, and were then stressed by appeals to history.

Machiavelli's purpose is a study of the art of government, rather than a theory of the state. His interests lay with those of the governing class, not of the governed. The spirit and moves of the latter are treated merely as incidental to the activity of the former. Hence, Machiavelli's works have given him a bad reputation. The Prince analyses the political system of the strong monarch while the Discourses analyses that of the strong republic. Both the works are concerned with methods of those who wield the power of the state rather than the fundamental relationship inside the state.

4.2 Political Ideals of Machiavelli

Politics and Morality

It was Machiavelli's attitude towards morality and religion which clearly established his reputation. It is by this that he has been recognized as the expression of a definite break with the middle ages. Some of the earlier thinker had likewise relegated the dictates of religion and morality to a subordinate position in relations to the theory and practices of Politics. Machiavelli brushed aside the law of nature and the law of God. He is the first thinkers to have formally and consciously separated politics from ethics. Although Aristotle had done it earlier, it was rather an incident that an essential in his system. He never proclaimed the independence of political doctrines from moral issues. Machiavelli, on the other hand, systematically sought to isolate politics from morality. He did not at all deny the excellence of the moral virtues, but he did not regard them as essential to political virtues.

Machiavelli discussed the use of violence, cruelty, bad faith and all other vices with expressions of moral disapproval. Nor did he appreciate the employment of virtue and religion. His indifference is equated with sympathy towards evil. He lays it down that while it is most praiseworthy for a prince to be good, nevertheless one who wishes to maintain his authority must be ready to set aside his goodness at any moment. Since no man can be expected to possess all the virtues, the ruler should avoid those vices which endanger the state thereby relieving himself of concern about the virtues which are necessary to preserve it. Machiavelli says that, 'The Prince must

appear all sincerity, all uprightness, all humanity, all religion, but he must be prepared to act regardless of these, if necessary, in order to save the state. "I believe that when there is fear for the life of the state, both monarchies and republics, to preserve it, will break faith and display ingratitude". Machiavelli is not immoral, but unmoral in his politics. According to his philosophy, moral judgments are wholly subordinate to the exigencies of political exigencies of political existence and welfare. Similarly, he is not irreligious but unreligious. As an important instrument of state policy religious sentiment must always be taken into account by the statesmen. The decline of respect for religion is the surest sign of approaching ruin for the state and also wise statesmen are able to achieve reforms beyond their normal power through appeal to religious sentiment.

The existence of the state is the first principle of his thought. This is found in the dictates of unscrupulous patriotism. "Where the safety of one's country is at stake there must be no consideration of what is just or unjust, merciful or cruel, glorious or shameful, on the contrary, everything must be disregarded save that course which will save her life and maintain her independence".

Another influence that worked in determining Machiavelli's treatment of the relation of politics to morality was his admiration of power and efficiency in man. He was a sort of hero-worshiper who liked the strong man and his art. His familiarity with the working of Florentine government strongly confirmed the natural disposition to minute analysis of the elements which combined to make the policy of a state fixed, coherent and definite.

The separation of politics from ethics is maintained by Machiavelli as a result of the conviction that this corresponds most closely to the facts of human existence. He is a student of practical politics and he seeks to determine other working of a real political life. He is not interested in building up an ideal state. There is a great difference between how men live and how they ought to live. Of these Machiavelli selects the former as the subject of his investigation. This point of view helps to correct the tendency to make political science a mere collection of moral and religious precepts. It also involves the interpretation of history and the formulation of political philosophy in terms of the most advanced rationalism of the renaissance.

4.3 Political Motives

While trying to find out the motives by which men are guided in social and political life, Machiavelli looks at them as purely selfish and as activated always by impulses in which social virtue have no part. All political phenomena are explained in terms of narrow self interest. Machiavelli's opinions are frankly expressed in the 'Prince'. Generally men are "Ungrateful, fickle, deceitful, cowardly and avaricious". From this, he draws the conclusion that a monarch should aim rather to be feared than to be loved. For love implies a bond of obligation which men being essentially selfish, break on every time when their own interest demands it, while fear holds them indefinitely. Again, the simple mindedness of men and their readiness even to submit to the needs of the moment make them as easy prey to an unscrupulous leader. He who wishes to deceive will always find

<p>CYP Question 1. Explain the Machiavell i's views on politics and Morality</p>

some one to be deceived'. Men are by nature vicious, hence the wise prince can never trust his counselors, but must depend upon his own judgment.

Men have by nature endless desires. Their craving for additional satisfaction governs all their activities. One of the most potent of these desires is that which finds satisfaction in private property. In the Prince, Machiavelli declares that men more readily forget the death of a father than the loss of patrimony. Hence there should be no confiscation at all. In the discourses the same idea receives fuller development. The love of independence and self government is explained by materialistic individualism. Very few people are actuated by the desire to exercise power, the masses seek security for person and property. Republican government is desired because it gives a chance of material benefit to a majority of the people. In a monarchy the prince absorbs all the profit for himself. People desire independence because wealth multiplies most in states which are not subject to others.

4.4 Forms of Government

Like Aristotle, Machiavelli classifies governments into monarchy, aristocracy and constitutional democracy with the three corresponding corruptions – tyranny, oligarchy and democracy. Like Polybus and Cicero he concludes that a mixed form is the best and most stable. The Discourses is a study of popular government in relation to the same end.

Though he has a bad reputation, Machiavelli is not an advocate of despotisms. He appreciates republican form of government no less than Aristotle. For a community in which a general economic equality prevails, Machiavelli holds that the commonwealth is the best and indeed, the only possible form of government. The people as a whole are wiser than a prince. The judgment of the people, especially in matters like the choice of officials and the assignment of honours, is in general sound and unimpeachable. If a prince is best suited to the original establishment of political institutions, a popular government is best suited to maintain them. Finally the republic has an advantage over the monarchy in respect of adaptation to time and circumstances, which is essential to the success of a government policy. While the prince will not change with conditions, in a republic, one who is suitable to the particular needs of a given time, may always be found.

Machiavelli does not favour aristocracy. For him, the upper class is mainly concerned with the desire for the exercise of authority, while the masses desire only peace and order. A landed aristocracy in particular, renders free government impossible. Their possession of castles and subjects of their own is fatal to all social order.

Thus Machiavelli opts for a commonwealth based on the mass of equal citizens. But he is aware that circumstances require different forms of organizations at different times and at different places. He pays particular attention to the problem of finding a system of organization that is best adapted to the establishment of far reaching dominion. What Plato and Aristotle regard as unworthy of

consideration by statesman or philosopher, thus becomes the central point of interest with Machiavelli.

4.5 Preservation of the State

Machiavelli discusses in his works various principles on which depends the ordinary peaceful working of both monarchic and republican institution. For the stability of monarchy the first great rule is respect for the established institution and customs of the land. Men who are well governed, and whose familiar way of life are preserved will not seek any further liberty. This consideration should guide both hereditary and usurping monarchs. The hereditary monarch does not have must of problems. But the newly established ruler faces a troublesome situation. Machiavelli is more concerned with the latter.

CYP
Question
2. Explain
the various
forms of
Government

All government rests ultimately on force, hence the prince must have a good army. He must not depend on foreign mercenaries or allies. While he should be parsimonious with his own money and that of his subjects, he must be lavish in distributing the spoils of war. He should be severe rather than mild in his attitude towards public affairs. Above all, he must keep his hands off the property and the woman of his subjects. He should Endeavour to be feared but not hated by the people. Accordingly, those duties which involve odious responsibility should be performed by subordinates, while acts of grace must surround his projects with an air of grandeur and must take decisive role in the controversies of neighboring states. He must pose as the patron of distinguished fine arts, and must liberality encourage commerce and agriculture and must not tax them heavily.

Machiavelli's idea of commonwealth or republic, is wholly that of ancient times, namely, city states. The commonwealth implies the rule of the mass of the people as distinguished from aristocracy. Machiavelli maintains the earlier distinction between 'pure' and 'corrupt' republics. When there is no sense of equality among the citizens, the republic become corrupt. Whatever may be the form of the republic. Machiavelli is interested in its preservation. In this he is influenced by the example of the Republic of Rome.

He analyses the inter-relationship of constitution, custom and law in the working of republican government. He always maintains the distinction between the fundamental law of the state and ordinary legislation. Law and customs are closely interdependent; a change in custom will easily be followed by corresponding changes in the laws. But the constitution does not change like this. Remaining intact it becomes out of harmony with custom and legislation. Therefore it is a source of ruin to the state. Any adaptation of constitution and law to the varying conditions in a state is indispensable to the preservation of republican constitution and must always be made with the minimum deviation from the traditional forms. For people are generally content with appearances and do not penetrate the realities of things.

Machiavelli also provides for the which may be used for a bad cause too. Therefore, the Roman dictatorship, carefully limited by well defined methods of creation and termination, furnishes a model for all free governments.

Party strife are generally regarded as being against the interests of the state. But Machiavelli takes a stand on this prominent feature of Roman history. For him, party struggles furnish a necessary vent to the emotions and ambitions of the leading citizens, and call into existence the institutions and laws of government of the later days. All these results are evident in the history of Rome and all are essential to a growing republic. Machiavelli suggests the need for further channels for the expression of popular feelings. Facilities must be provided for making charges against public officials and to have them investigated. Men of ability are always looked upon with suspicion by the masses. In times of peace they are neglected in republics, and the leadership falls into the hands of the rich and well connected. An escape from such perils was found by Rome in the policy of incessant war, through which the best of her citizens were always kept in the front. Thus normal and indispensable conditions of existence.

4.6 Extension of dominion

The theory and practice of expansion of monarchy is found in the Prince, while the expansion of republic is the theme of the Discourses. The process consists in the subjection of a number of states to the rule of a single prince or commonwealth. Machiavelli's plea for a unified Italy is influenced by the French Spanish monarchies. His conception of unity was to determine all the changes of political geography in Western Europe for three centuries after Machiavelli's death.

<p>CYP Question 3. Give a sum up on preservatio n of the state</p>
--

An ambitious prince meets with the least resistance from people of his own race. It is easy to hold acquisitions made in the same country, the conqueror has merely to put an end to the line of the former ruler and let the old institutions remain. Acquisition of states in a country differing in languages and institutions from that of the conqueror involves more complex problems. If a conquering prince reduces a republican state, he has the most serious difficulties. Here the spirit of liberty and the memory of the ancient constitution will always serve as an inspiration to revolt and the only safe policy is to destroy the community.

The surest test of a great man is his ability to introduce and maintain a new constitution. The reformer faces the open hostility of those who derive profit from the old order, and the support of those who have only hope, but no certainty, of benefit from the new. Success in framing the constitution justifies the assignment of high position among statesman like Moses, Cyrus, Romulus, and Thesis. They all possessed sufficient armed force to defend the new constitutions when persuasion ceased to be effective.

The tendency towards extension of dominion is found in both republic and monarchies. A prince is tempted by the insatiable craving for power, which is natural to men, and a republic is sure to be driven to it by necessity. If a republican constitution is not suitable to a policy of expansion the foundations of the state will be shaken when the necessity for such a policy arises, and the constitution will be destroyed. In the Discourses, Machiavelli spells out the elements of Roman system of expansion as follows. Increase the population of the

city, acquire allies rather than subjects, establish colonies in the acquired territory, turn all booty into the treasury, carry on war by field campaigns and pitched battles instead of sieges, keep the state rich and the individual poor, and maintain a well trained army. Machiavelli stresses upon the force of arms. He destroys the common saying that “money is the sinews of war”, not money, but good soldiers are the essence of strength, for, he says “money will not always procure good soldiers but good soldiers will always procure money”.

In the last analysis, however, Machiavelli concedes that physical force is not as decisive as craft. Men can never rise to greatness without the use of force and craft. But while force without craft is never sufficient, craft without force will meet with success. This principle applies to monarchies as well as republics, as demonstrated by the example of the Romans.

Machiavelli is sometimes called the first modern political thinker. He ends the medieval era and begins the modern. His significance is two-fold. Firstly, by emphasizing the legitimacy of political study, he helped to lay the groundwork for such seventeenth century thinkers as Hobbes. He emancipated political science from ecclesiastical control. This was to become characteristic of the nature of politics in an age when convention and law broke down and the individual was emancipated from many hitherto accepted restraints. His insight into the politics of his time was remarkable.

The object of the two works of Machiavelli is to procure the salvation of Italy through the establishment of an efficient government. Machiavelli's two books show that he is for the theory of preservation of actual Italian states. The Italy of his days was a land of misery and distress, factions and struggles. There was no security of life, honour and property. Machiavelli being a genuine patriot wanted to give to the Italian states, peace, order, stability and security and desired above all his own dear Florence to take the lead in the liberation of Italy from foreigners. But he was essentially a craftsman and diplomat of the first order in politics, by no means a philosopher and therefore he laid down in his works, detailed rules for setting up an efficient government. Machiavelli was a political scientist, not a political philosopher. He is concerned with ends not means.

'The Discourses' of Machiavelli depicts the republican form of government as the best for normal people, who can be made patriotic, while 'The Prince' holds for an absolute Monarchy for the people who are very corrupt, because he felt that corrupt people cannot be patriotic. Machiavelli is very much remembered for the book 'The Prince' dedicated to Lorenzo of the Medici family ruling over Florence.

Machiavelli bases his advocacy of the different means on some fundamental assumptions.

Man is essentially selfish, caring for his own life, honour and more ready to forgive the murder of his father than the seizure of his own property.

As the nature of man is ever the same and unchanged, man can only be compelled to goodness.

A morally good action of man is only that which furthers the security of life, honour and property for the state. The welfare of the state is now the standard of morality. So that whatever promotes it is good and must be undertaken by the ruler or by the subjects. No matter, even if, thereby, they lose their soul. The state is an end in itself for which men exist and not vice-versa. "The Discourse" suggests some of the following means to set up an efficient government.

Public spirit must be developed among the citizens and it means the complete subordination of all personal interests to the state and is therefore another name for Bigoted (Bigoted means Blindly devoted to a particular creed or party) totalitarian patriotism. Each citizen must be taught that he must so identify himself with the state that the only virtue that matters for him is the public spirit.

The government must generate this public spirit among the citizens by means of religion and liberty.

4.7 Machiavelli's concept of Religion

Machiavelli is interested in religion not because it is a means for the spiritual salvation, but only because it gives sentimental support to the stability of the state. The observance of divine worship is the cause of the greatness of a state. Naturally the contempt of it is the cause of its ruin. Fear of God fear of Prince must be there. But the fear of Prince is a poor substitute for the fear of God, because it will not last long. Hence, every state principality or republic needs to hold the religion and maintain the corruption less state. Machiavelli wants not Christianity, but a religion after the type of the old Rome, which teaches that he who serves the state best serves the Goods.

CYP
Question
4. Explain
Machiavelli's
concept
of Religion

According to Machiavelli, liberty fosters public spirit among the citizens so that they enjoy a security of life, honour and prosperity.

Machiavelli advocated the elimination of paid troops, which was so largely prevalent in Italy. He wanted the creation of a national army of all able bodied men between 17 and 40 years of age. There must be good laws which will make the state healthy. It must be made safe against all enemies, actual and potential. Public spirit is the very essence of power, says Machiavelli.

4.8 The Prince

Machiavelli advocated the arbitrary rule of the Prince, as the salvation for the people, who are thoroughly corrupted as not to have even an iota of patriotism. 'The Prince' was written for Princes certainly not written for the general public. Actually this is an essay on what makes for success in Italy from the Prince's point of view.

This is written to show what the Prince must understand, what he must do and not do in order to consolidate his position and dominion. It has references throughout to the Italian conditions.

4.9 Machiavelli's Principle for Prince

The prince should be careful in the expenditure of public money; it is very plain that lavish spending by the Prince leads to seizure of private property and there will be hatred between the ruler and the ruled. The Prince must be a combination of a fox and lion. The Prince should be cunning like a fox to know where the enemy will trap him. He should be like a lion. The prince should always keep up his promises. But if the situation and environment compels he can break the promise. Machiavelli expects the Prince must be faithful, human, religious and upright. But in case of need and necessity he can change his mind. A prince should not be timid or cowardly.

The prince should be both loved and feared. If the situation compels to choose between the two, he has to select the second one. The Prince should know how to use force as well as laws. If at all the Prince wishes to have name and fame, he must engage himself in exceptional deeds, which will give rise to a lot of discussion among the people. The prince must also see that he is respected not hated by the citizens. The prince should not postpone the wars because it may give a chance to the enemy to strengthen himself. The Prince must know how to distinguish between truth and flattery so that he will not fall a prey to flattery. In the selection of his ministers, he must be very careful. He must select only the wise, the faithful and the gifted

as ministers. The prince should disband the old un submissive army and create a new band of army.

Machiavelli lays down two rules, which the Prince must follow. He must be rather self-centered. Whatever he provides to the people must be in his own interest. He must obtain the loyalty of his subjects by giving them security of life, property and honour. To ensure the security of his dominion, he must extend it always. If the annexed kingdom is of the same language, custom and country, he must only do away with its ruler. At the same time, if it is alien he must destroy the fullers and rule through agents. After strengthening his position, placate his people, by sending these agents to the gallows. Because of the difficulty of dealing with alien people Machiavelli wants the Prince not to undertake the conquests of alien kingdoms.

In the last chapter of 'The Prince' he breaks out into a strong fervent appeal to the Medici Prince Lorenzo, to raise the standard of revolt against the foreigners and to take the lead in this holy work of liberation. It is true that he speaks only of the liberation. But he die hope for ultimate union of all Italy.

Machiavelli's books dissociate ethics from Politics. For some Machieavelli looked like an atheist. Ofcourse Machiavelli made a distinction between private morals and public morals. Machiavelli justified unmoral means of rulers to gain their ends. At the same time he says moral corruption in the people will spoil the good government. The king is outside the social group and he is above morality in public. By his action, he takes care of the welfare of the

people. So Machiavelli justifies adoption of unmoral means by the Prince if there is need.

In other words for the sake of the temporal welfare of the state and for the sake of setting up of an efficient government, the ruler may do any dishonorable action towards his subjects and towards other states because the world is so wicked that he cannot obtain his purpose. When the safety of the country is at stake there need be no question of what is just or unjust.

According to Sabine, Machiavelli is not applying the proper historical method for an inductive study of the origin of the state. His method was one of observations, guided by his shrewdness. His own experience counts more than his readings, the appeal to past history only to confirm the conclusions he has drawn by an observation of his own contemporary Italian conditions.

Machiavelli was an Italian of the first quarter of the 16th century. Had he written in any other time and place his conception of politics would have been significantly different. It is impossible to suppose that he would have treated religion as he did. In this sense, Machiavelli is called the child of his time.

4.10 A Meager conception of State

The state is absolutely essential to maintain security, for men are essentially selfish. The Sophists and Hobbes also hold the same view. Hobbes says that state emerged by a contract. But Machiavelli refers to no contract at all. The state exists only to obtain the temporal

welfare by any means. So the state is only an organization of force ruler has the power of doing whatever is needed for the success. He has neither the right of commanding obedience nor any divine or popular sanction for his authority. The subjects have no duty of obedience but obey out of fear and selfishness. Machiavelli is also of the opinion that state must expand continuously.

When Machiavelli hoped for the ultimate union of Italy after the expulsion of the foreigners, there can be no serious doubt, it may be accepted that Machiavelli saw the community of language and custom as the best basis for the state. So he could have seen Italy, as a natural state, which had lost its natural political unity and must recover that unity. It may be fairly said therefore that he aspired to make Italy a nation-state. Though aspiration is not the same as conception, the concept of a nation state can easily be derived from what he said or implied.

4.11 Summary

Machiavelli is called the first modern political philosopher. He ends the medieval era and begins the modern. It is described as a gross exaggeration. There are several reasons for this view. The first reason is since Machiavelli's doctrine is formally statecraft and not a theory of state how can it appreciably end the medieval thought and appreciably influence the thought of the 16th century and after?

The second reason is that he has not considerably ended the medieval political theory. The chief medieval doctrines were universalism with the church and empire as two branches. There is

one emperor for all Christendom with the different Kingdoms as his dependencies; popular Sovereignty, authoritarian control in all matters, the conception of law as ultimately the will of the people and as the embodiment of natural Law – Now none of these political doctrines does Machiavelli destroy formally as a philosopher.

At the same time Machiavelli has exerted some influence on later political thought. His method of relying on facts for the solution of problems and his refusal to consider the problems that were beyond his observation led to the development of political thought, particularly utilitarianism. Machiavelli had at least some share in releasing men from the assumption of the church and state.

Machiavelli was clear sighted in his thought but not far sighted. Machiavelli's standard of morality is unacceptable.

4.12 Key words :

The prince, Morality Romans, governing class, Violence, Self Interest, Constitution.

4.13 Answer for CYP Question :

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 4.3

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 4.5

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 4.6

Question No.4 – Refer Paragraph No. 4.7

4.14 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, Londonm Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D.Gemino. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chieage, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medicval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

4.15 Model Question

- 1.Examine Machiavelli's views on religion and morality.
2. Machiavelli's is the Model Political thinker,"- Discuss.

Unit – 5

Thomas Hobbes

(1588 - 1679)

Introduction :

Thomas Hobbes was born in 1588. This was the year of Spanish Armada. He said that his mother gave birth to himself and fear. His father was a Vicar who deserted his wife and three children. Hobbes was able to read and write even at the age of four. It shows that he was born brilliant. At the age of six he learnt Greek and Latin. He went to Oxford at the age of 15. The next stage in his life was on leaving Oxford; he was appointed companion and tutor to the heir of Lord Cavendish who was later Earl of Devonshire. Until his death in 1679, Hobbes was associated with Cavendish family. Because of their high connection in England, he met the leading men of the day, such as Bacon, Harvey, Calileo and so on. He was a wide traveler and spent about twenty years in Paris.

In the year 1640, the British Parliament began to assert its powers against the royal authority. At that time Hobbes fled to Europe, afraid of his life's danger. Hobbes writings supported the monarchical cause. He himself could not accept the supremacy of Parliament. In Paris Hobbes was tutor to Charles II, son of king Charles I who was executed in England, during 1645. In 1651 Hobbes returned back of England because his opinion on religion antagonized the French clergy. Protectorate England accepted Hobbes. So he spent the rest of his life in the Devonshire household.

Objectives:

- To study the Hobbes Method of approach to politics
- To explain the views of Hobbes on state and social contract.
- To understand the forms of government according to Hobbes.
- To analyze Hobbes views on the concept of sovereignty.

Unit Structure

- His Works
- Hobbes' Methodology
- Method of approach to Politics
- The State of Nature
- Might is Right
- Hobbes' Social Contract
- Forms of Government
- Sovereignty
- Evaluation and Criticism of Hobbes
- Key words
- Answers for CYP Question
- Books for further Reading
- Model Question

5.1 His Works

His greatest and important work 'Leviathan' was published in 1651 while he was in exile in Paris. In 1642 he published 'De Cive'. 'Elements of Law' was published in 1650. He published 'De corpora' after returning back to England in 1655 and De Homine in 1659. Of all the works Leviathan represents Hobbes political thought. And also this was subject to severe criticism because of the propositions of materialism and despotism.

5.2 Hobbes' Methodology

Hobbes felt that geometrical method was the only scientific method. Hobbes philosophy was based on Euclid and Descartes. Euclid's elements of geometry impressed him very much. The method he used here is deduction from assumptions and already established truths. Plato too has used this method.

5.3 Method of approach to Politics

Hobbes builds his philosophy of man and of state not on reason, but as the law of motion. This says he, constitute a sufficient explanation of all activities of man. Being a lover of geometry, he deduces from these laws by a geometrical reasoning that all the activities of man, emotions, behavior, sensation and knowledge are but motion caused by excitement from without and reaction either favorable or unfavorable, to his biological growth. Political philosophy therefore is for Hobbes a prior knowledge of the same nature as Mathematics and geometry.

Hobbes' book Levitation was in support of the royal cause which was the definite purpose of the book. But Hobbes did not state it so openly and crudely.

In the first place like Machiavelli, he wants to solve the same question "how can man, being essentially selfish and unsocial and seeking the preservation of life, be saved from anarchy? He was talking about absolute government. In the second place, he advocates

the absolutism of government for the sake of the happiness of the individual.

5.4 The State of Nature

It was the situation of 'war with all' as said by Hobbes. The reasons given by him are that man is by nature egotistic, unable to stand the company of others. In the state of nature he acts not by reason but by emotions only, the primary emotions being preservation of life and gratification of appetite. Human Beings wish to secure a large share of goods that are available. Man is essentially selfish, stupid and egotistic. He possesses the faculty of reasoning at the same time absurdity also. Man acts in such a way not because of his intellect or by reason but by his appetites, desires and passions.

**CYP
Question**
1. Define
views on
the State
of Nature

5.5 Might is Right

Man knows no other good, no disinterested love for other men, no parental or filial love. He is only self-interested. He has no pity over the misfortunes of others. Right and justice being connected with the observances of promises or contracts are conspicuous by their absence in the state of nature. Men do not and cannot stand one another's company.

Nature has made all men absolutely equal in the faculties of body and soul. Even the physically weak man can over power by means of trick the physically strong. Intellectually also all are equal, for not only does each man consider himself as the wisest creature on earth, but also Hobbes preaches an individualism more uncompromising than that of Locke.

Hobbes make a distinction between natural right and natural law. Natural right means liberty where as natural law implies primarily a restriction rather than liberty.

The state of nature, where every one has equal rights is a state of war. There is no certainty in respect of life. In the State of nature nothing can be unjust. The right and wrong, justice and injustice are not to be found there in the State of nature. Force and fraud flourished in that atmosphere. This was the condition in which man was placed by nature. Hobbes' state of nature was philosophical and not historical.

The natural state of man has some common characteristics. First, there is no distinction between right and wrong. Passion is the only impulse. Secondly, there is no distinction between just and unjust. There was no law and no common superior; when there is no law, there is no justice. The final fact in the state of nature is there is no such thing as private property, because in the state of nature, might is right.

By the light of nature man is obliged to renounce some part of his claim for the realization of a better purpose. Where everyone has the equal right in a state of war. But there will be uncertainty of life. In order to give protection to life natural law was invoked. The basic principle of natural law is to seek peace and observe it, thereby escape from the state of war. For this there must be the abandonment of natural right. There must be recruitment from war. Justice is the keeping of the promise; injustice is the failure to keep them.

Generally promises are made with a selfish motive. The existence of a superior will make man to keep up the promise but there is such no superior in the state of nature. That is why there is no relevance of injustice or justice.

All should obey the law of nature. If only one man is modest, and faithful in his promises, while all other not, he would be destroying himself.

Hobbes rejects the validity of natural law because it places itself above the legal sovereign. To put it simply law of nature is not a law at all. The laws of nature are equity, justice, gratitude and other moral virtues. So the law of nature can be described as nothing but a set of general principles of civil law.

5.6 Hobbes' Social Contract

This social contract theory of Hobbes is fundamentally different from that of the earlier contracts hinted by earlier thinkers. The earlier contracts were government contracts. It was between the ruler and the people. But Hobbes' contract is social contract, in other words contract among the people themselves.

According to Hobbes, there are two ways by which a common wealth may come into existence. First by institution, men of their own impulse unite. Second by acquisition. This is when some superior power threatens them with destruction, this fear induces, men to unite and seek peace. The first one is considered as hundred percent social contract.

Hobbes is a rationalist and believes that reason is an integral part of man. Social impulse was not the first cause of the state but self-preservation brought the state into contract not to do to one another what they would not wish to have done to themselves. Generally, man has the capacity to learn prudence and moderation, his desire for power and glory may tempt him to break his promise. For the sake of restraining power men were in need of a sovereign authority and it should be vested with all powers.

Who are the parties to the contract? They are the individual natural men and not the people in collectivity not the groups of individuals. The sovereign is the creation of contract and not the party to the contract. The state thus created is a real unity, a single personality taking the place of many. This single personality determines the commonwealth. The individual has surrendered his natural right, which is assumed by the state. Such is the origin of the state according to Hobbes.

The purpose of state is maintenance of peace both internal and external. It is an integral part of contract.

This social contract theory found favour for many centuries. It satisfied the sense of equity. It proclaimed the gospel of government by consent. There are some criticisms of it. Basically Hobbes makes fear to be the strongest basis of contract. But fear of what? It is fear of losing life and property. Men are generally afraid of dangers of disobedience. But there is exaggeration in Hobbes's fear. Fear is

something uncertain. Hobbes lays emphasis on distrust; this does not make men in the state of nature make a contract. Hobbes said that men in the state of nature were brutes and beasts, how could they suddenly develop reasoning, co-operative effort for making a social contract. Contract is the product of society and certainly society is not the product of contract.

5.7 Forms of Government

Even though Hobbes was the supporter of monarchy, he said any state, which could provide peace and security, is the best. So he felt that location of power is of minor importance. Hobbes was very much against division of power between the king and the parliament. It is a source of danger and makes one of them supreme. Hobbes theory of sovereignty is applicable to Britain where the parliament is sovereign; at the same time to France where the monarch Louis XIV was the Sovereign.

**CYP
Question**
2.
Classify
the
Governm
ent

Hobbes classifies the common wealth into three. In the first one where a man is vested with all powers, the state is monarchy, it is democratic where the powers are vested in the assembly. Where the assembly is restricted to a few people it is aristocratic. Hobbes could not accept any mixed form, which he considered as absurd.

But it is very plain and well known that Hobbes prefers monarchy for his own reasons. He says that there is complete identity of private with public interest in the sovereign. In the formulation and execution of the policy, there will be consistency and continuity. Monarchy has fewer favorites but favorites of the groups of men are

always large. In monarchy there is less competition of officer and power. It is easier for one than for many to act. Hobbes felt that evils are less in monarchy.

5.8 Sovereignty

Apart from the nature of the sovereign, sovereignty implies enormous powers and is absolute. Because the sovereign never renounces any of his rights like other men have abandoned the state of nature. The Sovereign did not abandon it. He possesses the unlimited right of nature. Absolute power is vested in the monarch.

**CYP
Question**
3. What
is meet
by
Sovereig
nty

It is said that monarch receives the authority from the people. But he has no obligation to them. Because his will is law. There is no limit to his power. The assumption is that the Sovereign can do no wrong. He won't do any harm to the citizens. He will do well to the people.

The sovereign is above law and can't be punished. But every act of disobedience by the subject is unjust. The authority of King cannot be disregarded by a covenant with God. This is for obvious reasons that without the knowledge of sovereign, no contract with God can be made.

There cannot be another compact without the consent of sovereign there can be no other agreement.

As the Sovereign is not the party to contract, breach of original compact by the Sovereign cannot be the grounded for disregarding the

authority of the Sovereign, because this is a social contract among individuals.

The sovereign has the power to control opinions and doctrines. Hobbes considers that the freedom of expression is the greatest source of evil. To govern men effectively, their opinions must be controlled first. The Sovereign has full control over the property of the individual, because the individual by agreement transferred the natural right to property to the control of the Sovereign. The Sovereign is the fountain of justice. The Sovereign has the power to make war and peace.

The sovereign is supreme both in spiritual and in temporal matter. Sovereignty is an indivisible power. It cannot be shared with the church.

Hobbes formulates a doctrine of liberty. Liberty according to Hobbes has a double meaning, one for the ruler and another for the subject. The Sovereign has the liberty to do anything but individual freedom is limited. The individual can do all the things that is not prohibited.

There is a distinction between divine law and human law. But divine law is not law because the sovereign does not issue it. Custom is also not law unless it is recognized by the Sovereign.

Hobbes saw that religion and church are the most serious danger to civil order and also to the unity of the country.

5.9 Evaluation and Criticism of Hobbes

Hobbes was the first Englishman to present a system of political philosophy. Hobbes set politics above religion.

Hobbes took efforts to direct the creation of State. But Hobbes' social contract theory was an unfortunate one. Because it tended to prevent a realistic analysis of the complicated requirements of social life and the reasons why men support the state. Hobbes was far more fettered by tradition and rule than the modern citizens of a democratic state.

The state created by Hobbes is inadequate. The 'Leviathan of Hobbes' is a policeman and not the instructor. It has no vision of the Greek ideal of the state.

Hobbes was not the father of totalitarianism, fascism or communism. These theories reject contract theory. Hobbes' state is authoritarian and not totalitarian. He pleads for equality of all before law. Hobbes, authority is concentrated only in the political sphere. Hobbes is a believer in the theory of Laissez-Faire.

Another principle of Hobbes was he holds that the Sovereign may be one man or an assembly of men. But for practical reasons he preferred monarchy.

Hobbes' state is not a modern democratic state. It is not a totalitarian dictatorship. For Hobbes' state exists in order to serve man and its authority is derived from the consent of the governed.

5.10 Key words

Behavior, Absolute Right, Gospel, Sovereign, Authority, Justice, God, Britton

5.11 Answers for CYP Question :

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 5.4

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 5.7

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 5.8

5.12 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, London Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D. Geminio. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chicago, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. McMillan. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medieval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2

Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

5.13 Model Question

- 1. Examine Hobbes' view of the state and social contract.**
- 2. Discuss the Social Contract Theory of Hobbes.**

Unit – 6
JOHN LOCKE
(1632-1704)

Introduction :

17th Century England produced another political thinker named John Locke. His name became very popular in the history of political thought. Locke was born to a Puritan, Somerset lawyer, in 1632. His father was a captain in the Parliamentary Army during the civil war. He lost his mother and father in childhood. Locke had his education at the West minister School. He developed a craze for science. In 1652, he joined Christ Church College, Oxford. There itself he served as a tutor. He never took a medical degree, even though he studied medicine. In the year 1688, he became the member of the Royal Society. Locke developed interest in natural science, because of his friends Robert Boyle and Isaac Newton. Descartes philosophy awakened his interest in philosophy. Locke saved the life of Lord Ashley in 1666, who was the leader of the Whig party. By then he became attached to Lord Ashley, who was later Earl of Shaftsbury. Locke was very much responsible for the preparation of fundamental constitution of Carolina. Shaftsbury became Lord High Chancellor of England, naturally Locke was appointed as special advisor. Locke had the direct experience of practical political affairs.

In 1675 Locke left for France because in that year Shaftsbury lost his position. After staying there of four years in 1679 he returned to England. By then Shaftsbury had become the leader of the opposition proved accused and imprisoned. But he escaped to

Holland and died in 1683. Locke also left or Holland and stayed there till 1689. On return to his place, that is England, Locke played an important role in the freedom of Press. By 1696 Locke was appointed as the commissioner to the Board of Trade and Plantation. Locke died at Essex in 1704.

Locke's Theory reflects the circumstances of his time. Locke who had suffered persecution under the Stuarts wished to justify revolution. Locke is an apostle of the Revolution of 1688, the most moderate and the most successful of all revolutions. Locke had an excellent common sense. He gathered the chief connections in philosophy, Politics, morals and education and passed these on to the 18th century.

Objectives:

- To study the views on Lock's State of nature.
- To define the social contract theory according to Lock.
- To explain the classification of governments by Lock

Unit Structure

- Works of Locke
- State of Nature
- The Law of Nature
- The Social Contract of Locke
- State and Society
- Classification of Governments
- Functions of the State
- Locke's Views on Property
- Summary
- Key words
- Answers for CYP Question
- Books for further Reading
- Model Questions

6.1 Works of Locke

In 1689 he wrote his first work “Letter concerning Tòleration” in Latin. In the same year its English version was published. In 1690 the essay concerning human understanding had appeared “The Two treatise on civil government was also published in the same year. In 1691 ‘third letter on toleration’ was published. In 1693, his thoughts concerning education was published. When Locke was in retirement ‘final letter on toleration’ was published. In all the writings Locke’s famous work was ‘the Two Treatise on civil government’.

6.2 State of Nature

Locke is different from Hobbes both in the beginning and also in his conclusion. Locke says in the state of nature men were free and equal. They lead their life according to their own liking, independent and not subject to any other will. In the state of nature there was peace, goodwill, mutual helpfulness and preservation. In the state of nature there are no privileges, not government and no one prescribe law for others. In the state of nature of Locke men lived together according to reason without a common superior. But Hobbes’ state of nature is state of war. All against all, life was brutish, and short, but according to Locke state of nature is not a state of savages but a community of virtuous anarchist, who are guided by reason. Further Locke says that state of nature is a stage through which men had to pass through.

6.3 The Law of Nature

In the state of nature, there is a law of nature, to govern it. The law of nature is the foundation of Locke's political philosophy. In his second Treatise on civil government, Locke states the law of nature. First he says that it is a law of equality. There are no privileges in the state of nature. The law of nature embodies the principles of self-interest.

**CYP
Question**
1. What
is meant
by state
of nature.

Secondly, the law of nature enjoins the practice of truth and the keeping of faith. Parents are under the obligation to educate their children; in return the children should honour and protect their parents. That is the law of nature. Thirdly, in the state of nature no man has arbitrary power over the life, liberty and possessions of another. Fourthly, in the law of nature people have a right of revolution. Private property to the individual and the respect for the property of others followed in the law of nature.

The question is what prompted men to give up their natural liberty. The reason is the state of nature was deficient in three important respects. First, the state of nature was full of doubts and difficulties. Secondly there is no third party in the state of nature who has no personal disputes. The third, in the state of nature, the person whose interests have been offended was not being strong enough to punish the offender.

6.4 The Social Contract of Locke

Locke says that the civil government is the result of a contract. According to Locke there are some important wants in the state of

nature. Because of these wants men were quickly driven to form a society. They want an established law; want a known and independent judge with authority to determine all differences according to the established law, want power to back and support the sentence when right and to give its due execution. According to Locke, each individual contracts with each to unite into and constitute a community. This contract was made for the protection and preservation of property. Rights given up by the individuals were not given up to any particular person or group of persons. Thus society is vested with political authority. In this theory of Locke, the community once formed may appoint a fiduciary or a trustee.

After society set up by contract government is established not by a contract but by a fiduciary trust. The legislature is supreme power and executive is subordinate to it. Behind the legislature the people supreme is the biggest authority, Locke did not speak in terms of a contract of society followed by the creation of a trustee. But the motion of trust implies contract. But there is a difference between trust parties namely trust or, trustee and the beneficiary. Whereas a contract implies only two parties.

6.5 State and Society

Locke makes a distinction between society and state. Hobbes argues that the dissolution of government destroys the society. Locke does not agree with Hobbes. He argues that the destruction of society occurs as a result of external forces. When the government is dissolved Locke does not anticipate chaos, as did Hobbes but thinks that society will set up another government to serve its purpose.

6.6 Classification of Governments

Locke classified government into three. If people assembled themselves from time to time and made laws by the majority decisions, it is democracy in the true sense of the term. It is oligarchy by which if the legislation is made by a number of select men. If the law making power is in the hands of a single man it is monarchy. Locke is not for monarchy since it may lead to despotism. Oligarchy lays interest in a particular group. For Locke Democracy alone is preferable. It provides adequate safeguards. Locke's theory of government gives an accurate description of the English Constitution.

The basis of all government, says Locke, is consent. Its corollary is the right of revolution. In 1676 Locke denied the right of resistance to the individual. This was his feeling before his expulsion by Charles. In 1689 Locke justified rebellion. To defend their rights, people can rebel against despots. Locke said the ruler who uses force without authority should be treated like an aggressor in war. Locke says that absolute governments is no government. An absolute state is a state of war. It is a state in which consent is not the basis. All governments is a moral trust and the idea of limitation is implied. Revolution is a reserve power. Right to revolution is subject to certain conditions. First the people should offer resistance only against the unjust and the unlawful. Second, the right of disobedience may not be exercised by any one man or by a group, but by a majority of the people who have suffered. Only may have the right of disobedience.

CYP Question

2. What are the various forms of Government

6.7 Functions of the State

The main function of the state is the formulation of rules by which life and liberty and property are to be secured, this is legislative function. The second function is the executive. That is the execution of laws. The third function is federative, which includes the making of treaties.

**CYP
Question**
3. What
are the
functions
of state

With regard to the relationship between the executive and the legislature, Locke says the executive is subordinate and accountable to the legislature. Legislature is supreme; at the same time it does not have unlimited powers. Locke says there should not be any discrimination between the rich and the poor. Law should not be arbitrary. Lastly, it must not transfer its power of law making to anybody else.

Locke advocates the separation of functions. Combining of functions is not advisable. But Locke insisted on the separation of powers, he recognized that strict separation may not always be possible or desirable. In this theory Locke is generalizing the fundamental principles of the English Constitution.

6.8 Locke's Views on Property

Locke says that property was an institution, which had existed in the state of nature itself. Locke had interest in the preservation of property. He says that the primary duty of the government is to preserve property unharmed. Actually Locke feels that men entered the society for the preservation of property.

Locke's theory of property differed from the typical theory that property is common; that nothing belonged to any one particular individual. Locke does not agree with this view. Men have formed the civil society with natural rights. The right to property was the first among them. The state does not create property. But property created the state for its protection. Locke says that the individual has no unlimited right over the property.

6.9 Summary

The political doctrine of Locke was influential not only in England but in France and America. also here his views were further developed and broadened. And also his political theory penetrated into France and passed through Rousseau and the French Revolution. Locke's work and his principles have been active in developing democratic institutions and democratic processes.

Actually this position continued till the outbreak of the First world war. Locke's principles are still practicable and useful. The new political movements which are springing up in almost every corner of the world are demanding a going back to Locke's principles. Locke is still the basis of our political structure.

6.10 Key words:

Parliaments Army, Imprisoned Morals, State of nature, Authority, Preservation Legislation.

6.11 Answers for CYP Question :

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 6.3

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 6.6

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 6.7

6.12 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, London Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D. Geminio. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chicago, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medieval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner
9. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

6.13 Model Questions

1. Explain Locke's Theory of Social Contract.
2. Evaluate Locke's contribution to political thought.

Unit – 7

JEAN JACQUES ROUSSEAU

(1712-1778)

Introduction :

Rousseau belonged to a respectable family. He was born on 28th June 1712 in Geneva, in Switzerland. His father was a watchmaker, a very able and competent man in profession. But volatile and extravagant in his habits. Rousseau has lost his mother and was brought up by his relatives. When he was just ten, years old his father fled from Geneva, to escape punishment for a quarrel with neighbor. Rousseau was sent to school by his uncles. He was left under a rotary but because of his subordination dismissed by him. When he was trained by an engraver, he got enough beatings from him and at the age of sixteen and ran away from the engraver. He started a wandering life. By chance he met a Catholic priest at consign now. This priest turned him to Roman Catholic faith. He was sent to a monastery at Turin. There he had education in the Roman faith; unfortunately Rousseau did not behave properly. So he was turned out. This is only a sample of the kind of life he was leading to his last days. He died in 1778.

An opera written by him was performed in one of the noted salons in the City of Paris. Because of this he was admired in the literary circles. By 1746 he came in to contact with Diderot and D' Alembert. He was invited to contribute to the projected encyclopedia. By 1750 he became world popular. He saw the advertisement for an award for the best essay on humanities. Now he realized the great

truth that man is normally good but the social institutions have made him evil. He got the award for his essay. Here onwards he occupied himself in literary activities. Unfortunately his books were condemned and he was about to be arrested. To escape from arrest he fled away to Switzerland and then to England at the invitation of David Hume. A quarrel with Hume made him return to Paris, Rousseau died in 1778.

Dunning says that Rousseau was “no statesman, no scholar and no philosopher but a child of genius”. His method of approach to politics is like a novel.

Objectives:

- To study the concept of Social contract
- To understand the nature of State.
- To Study the concept of Ressean’s General will.
- To explain the views of Rousseau on sovereignty and Religion

Unit Structure

- Works of Rousseau
- The State of Nature
- Transition to Political Society by Social Contract
- The Nature of Contract
- The Characteristics of the Contract
- The Consequences of the Contract
- Criticism
- State
- General will
- Criticism of General will
- Sovereignty
- Religion
- Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau : A Comparative Study
- Summary

- Key words
- Answers for CYP Question
- Books for further Reading
- Model Questions

7.1 Works of Rousseau

In 1754 he wrote 'Discourse on the origin of inequality'. In 1755 he wrote an article on Political Economy in the French Encyclopedia. His three famous works were 1. The Nouvelle Helorse 2. The Emile and 3. The social contract.

7.2 The State of Nature

It was at first one of idyllic happiness and later one of intolerable war between the rich and the poor. A period of idyllic happiness for man was not rational but emotional and independent of authority.

The natural man did not think and act by reason at all therefore had no ideas and no language and no foresight.

The natural man was only a noble savage, acting only by two primary emotional motives of self-interest in his own preservation and of disinterested pity for others in their hour of suffering. These two motives are Rousseau's 'natural law' and became the spring of his natural rights. Rousseau was the free and noble savage in the state of nature.

Men, who so far were solitary hunters now in course of time, took to agriculture. Naturally private property in land emerged. This private ownership of land led to inequality of men and inequality of

men led to wars between the haves and the have nots. The right of the strong became the rule.

7.3 Transition to Political Society by Social Contract

The rich now coaxed the poor to enter into a contract with them. By this contract private property was guaranteed and a government was set up to rule them all by wise law and to defend them against all aggression. As the government became the ally of the rich, the contract proved fatal to the poor. Despotism was set up everywhere. So men lost their liberty and also their original equality. "Man is born free, but everywhere he is in chains" said Rousseau.

7.4 The Nature of Contract

Rousseau treats with contempt any contract, which aims at mere civic community, and sets up an absolute authority claiming unlimited obedience from the subjects. Rousseau wanted a form of association, wherein to harmonize the absolute authority of the Sovereign with the absolute freedom of the citizens. This act of association produces a moral or collective body – a public person consisting of all the members that made the act. It is called the state when passively regarded and sovereign when actively regarded.

7.5 The Characteristics of the Contract

First it postulates a state of nature as the original condition of man. Second he desired to escape from it and therefore entered into a contract with his fellow subjects.

<p>CYP Question. 1. Describe the characteristic s of the contract.</p>

The parties to the pact are on the one side the individuals who surrender themselves to the community and on the other the community which receives all of them as members. All members with perfect unanimity make this act of consent. The contract is absolute. The alienation is total. After the contract all are equal, for they all surrendered themselves absolutely in the same manner, they all acquire over one another the same right and therefore 'Each Man, in giving himself to all, gives himself to nobody'.

There is only one contract, by which the collective body is both the state and sovereign. There is no governmental pact, for the government is not an equal, but a servant to the sovereign

7.6 The Consequences of the Contract

The state being artificial in origin is organic in nature. It is a moral, collective body; it is endowed like every individual person, with its own life and will and common ego, as distinct from those of the component individual members. Its life is the union of the members and its will is 'general will'. Rousseau's society is a covenant of social brotherhood, the starting point of the French revolutionary idea of Fraternity.

7.7 Criticism

Rousseau's contract is social like that of Hobbes, but it is not governmental like that of Locke. It is a mutual agreement between the individuals. Hobbes and Locke are combined together by Rousseau.

Even in the primitive times, people lived and conformed to certain conditions and were guided by certain condense of behavior. The earliest state was the family and the common superior was the head of the family. He ruled automatically and aristocratically. The idea of contract belongs to the later state of development. The condition of contract presupposes the existences of a system of law to support it. But in the state of nature there was no law. The idea of contract presupposes that the primitive man had the maturity of outlook but he had not that quality. No government was brought into existence by contract. Individuals who are naturally so separate and hostile would never have entered into a contract. Another feature is that the contract theory is illogical and unhistorical. All the governments that exist at present have been founded originally either on usurpation, conquest or both. Jeremy Bentham says the original compact is a fiction; it is ridiculous to consider the coronation oath or any other element in the constitution as contract. Bentham believed that utility is a better key to understand politics than any original contract; contract theory is dangerous in three ways.

First the supposition that the fundamentals of the constitution were established before the legislature affords a dangerous ground for disputing the authority of law. Second the idea that every violation of the compact on the part of governors releases the subject from his allegiance and dissolves the government would endanger the stability of every political society in the world. Further it induces the people to adopt an irreverent attitude towards the state. The hypothesis of contract is unnecessary for explaining the rights and

duties of government and of the governed. Rights and duties do not depend upon mutual recognition or embodiment in a contract.

With regard to positive law, the Sovereign can bring it into existence. The positive law may not be sanctioned as a legal contract. Contract is a fiction because no society originated in the way. It is an impossible fiction. The basic error of the theory of contract is that it falsely supposes a necessary connection between covenant and duty., In reality there is no connection. The theory of contract diverted the development of political science. Although it is unhistorical, it was the cause for freedom.

7.8 State

Rousseau regards the state as a progressive force. It is a civilizing force. It is an educative force. Rousseau does not suggest the return of man to the state of nature, because it is unstable and intolerable. The establishment of a state is based on the free will of all. The aim of good government was good life and not government of the people by the people. Later thinkers were concerned principally with self-government. Rousseau is the first modern writer to synthesis good government with self-government where the key concept is general will. The promotion of good of the community is not enough. The community itself must will this. Rousseau like Edmund. Burke demanded liberty for all citizens. Both of them opposed tyranny of every kind. '

**CYP
Question**
2. Define
Rousseau
views on
state

A true state said Rousseau, should be built upon the principle of freedom and justice. Rousseau was concerned with the state as the

means for the achievement of good life. Rousseau seems to believe that material needs of man may tend to disturb the society. Man is by nature sociable.

Rousseau makes a distinction between the state, and government. State is the entire body of politics. It manifests itself in the supreme and sovereign general will. The government on the other hand consists of individuals' chosen by the community for the execution of the general will.

7.9 General will

It is the key conception of Rousseau's political philosophy. Rousseau sees the body politic possessed of a will and this is the general will. It comes into existence when all the individual members of the group, sacrificing their own interests, unite together in aiming at some common good of the group as a whole. General will embodies the real will of all individuals. So there can be no conflict between the real will of the individual and general will because there is identity of interests between the two.

According to Rousseau the general will is directed to the attainment of general good. In general will, Rousseau is concerned with the quality of the object sought and not the quantity. The General will has two elements. First it aims at the general good. Second it must come from all and apply to all. The General will is concerned with common interest. On the contrary, the will of all is

**CYP
Question**
3. What
is meant
by
General
will?

concerned with private interest. It is no more that a sum of particular wills. General will may not be expressed by all but a single legislator or a single person may express it.

The general will is not an empirical fact. It may be a moral attitude existing in the heart of citizens. Rousseau's General will is a double-edged sword. It defends on democracy and ends on the establishment of a Leviathan. Rousseau rejects the parliamentary democracy. In this the General will cannot be represented. Representative democracy forgets the general interests. Rousseau prefers the method of the happiest people in the world to the methods of party government.

The Individual is free if he obeys the general will. If he refuses to obey, he will be forced to obey. Naturally he will be compelled to be free.

Rousseau is aware of the existence of a number of associations in the State. The state is not the only association to have a general will. Particular associations too have a General will in relation to their members. The General will of the State is the most comprehensive of all, embracing all the members of the community. The General will tends to the preservation and promotion of the welfare of the whole people. It is the source of law. As the General will is general, it is always right and always just. Wherever the General will exists all, have equal rights. This equality gives rise to civil liberty. Civil liberty is better than material liberty.

The individual will may be good or bad. But the General will is always good for obvious reasons that the state can do no wrong. That is why it is said that every act of the General will is just.

Rousseau's theory of General will seems to be nonsense, the facts of history contradict this claim frequently. Often men have consented to participate in acts which are extremely unjust. How can Rousseau justify that the General will is always for the good of all? But Rousseau's objective is every man always aims at general good. Rousseau asserts this but there are objections to it. All men or a group as a whole cannot wish the good of the group. General will is attained very rarely. Is General will possible or impossible? It is certainly possible. It is not an impossible altruism. There can be a General will without unanimity. But the majority people must remember that it should not go too far in the furtherance of its interests at the expense of the minority. If every member of the group is moved by the sense of fair play, we have a general will.

7.10 Criticism of General will

Rousseau's concept of General will is not complete. Collective opinion is not a very easy affair. A Number of factors decide collective opinion. How do we make a distinction between the General will and the will of all? His attempt to make the General will a reflection of Real will only adds more confusion. Rousseau's General will can be manufactured and maintained artificially by means of propaganda and other devices. The General will of Rousseau is rather abstract and narrow. Rousseau makes a distinction between the state and government, but in actual practice the

government in power has the unlimited sovereign power of the state at its disposal. The government instead of adjusting itself to the General will of the community may try to mould the General will to its own liking through the various effective means of propaganda and even coercion at its disposal. Rousseau's General will gives importance to common interest, which is difficult to define. Rousseau's theories of general will is objected to on the ground that it is not applicable to large states. In total General will stresses the corporate character of the society.

7.11 Sovereignty

In his concept of Sovereignty, Rousseau differs from that of Hobbes and Locke. Hobbes stresses the need for a sovereign power. It may be vested in an individual or in an assembly as the individual surrenders all his natural rights to the Sovereign at the time of contract, the sovereign becomes absolute. The sovereign was not a party to the contract. So any act of disobedience on the part of the subjects is unjust. The Contract should not be violated by the covenants. Even the breach of the original contract by the sovereign cannot be the ground for disobedience. Thus sovereign possesses, absolute and unlimited power. It has the power to control the expression of opinions and doctrines. Hobbes considers that the freedom of expression is the greatest source of evil.

**CYP
Question**
4. Explain
the concept
of Sovereignty

The sovereign has right to determine all controversies between the subjects. Sovereign can make war and conclude peace. Sovereign is endowed with absolute, inalienable and individual power.

Rousseau took from Hobbes one of the most important features of political philosophy that is the doctrine of sovereignty. But Rousseau believed that once sovereignty is vested in the people than in the monarch, it will destroy despotism.

The omnipotent ruler should be the people and not the monarch. So Rousseau talks about the General will which is the Sovereign. General will must be the real will and not be a mere aggregation of the wills of all.

Rousseau says that it can exist in the absence of political parties because political parties always struggle for domination. But it cannot be derived that political party only helps men get united for the promotion of national interest. Rousseau's Sovereignty was a compromise between the constitutionalism of Locke and the absoluteness of Hobbes.

7.12 Religion

Rousseau says that the existence of church resulted in the establishment of two sovereigns, fatherlands and two legislatures and so on. This creates two contradictory duties. The individual must decide whether to be faithful to religion or to the state. In the conflict between the church and the state Rousseau proclaims the supremacy of secular interests. Rousseau proposed the formation of a civil religion. Every individual must practice it. Any one who destroys it should be punished with death. Rousseau says that a man cannot be virtuous without religion. It is felt that the Greek philosopher who

<p>CYP Question 5. Give an account of Rousseau Views on Religion</p>

advocated state religions might have influenced Rousseau. At the same time he condemns ancient religions as superstitious.

7.13 Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau : A Comparative Study

‘With Rousseau’ observes Leacock, “The doctrine of Social Contract, which in the hands of Hobbes was made a weapon of defence for absolutism and with Locke a shield for constitutional limited monarchy, becomes the basis of popular sovereignty”. This observation clearly brings forth the different uses to which the social contract may be put. Hobbes, private tutor of Charles II, published his *Leviathan* in 1651 in order to defend monarchical absolutism. Locke another Englishman, published his *Two Treaties on Civil Government* in 1690 in order to defend the Revolution settlement of 1689. Rousseau a French man, published his *Social Contract* in 1762 in order to promulgate the theory of popular sovereignty. Each of these illustrious writers imagined a state of nature and explained the need and character of the contract in a way most suitable to arrive at the conclusion he wanted to maintain.

Hobbes and Locke agreed that men emerged from the freedom and equality of the state of nature by a covenant of the majority to form a political society, which compact, the law of nature obliges them to observe. But Locke did not agree with Hobbes that the natural state was a state of war. He seems to have regarded the want of a common judge and of a known law as the chief inconvenience of the state of nature. According to Hobbes, the state of nature is one of unceasing strife. The competition between man and man for the means to gratify identical appetites, the fear in each lest another surpasses him in power, and the craving for recognition as superior

are the causes of strife. It is a state of "Continual fear and danger of violent death, and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short". Finding this unbearable condition of life man is driven by evident necessity of joining himself with his fellows under some common authority. Each individual makes a covenant with his fellows surrendering their rights to enter into the state.

To Locke the state of nature is not one in which men live in brutish reciprocal hostility, but one in which peace and reason prevail. It is not a lawless state. Under the law of nature men enjoy their natural rights of life, liberty and property. But in the state of nature, there is no common organ for the interpretation and execution of the laws of nature. So the necessity of organizing civil society arises. According to Locke, each individual contracts with each to unite into and constitute a community for the purpose of preserving life, liberty and property.

Rousseau's state of nature is as anarchic as that of Hobbes and yet as good as that of Locke. Rousseau conceives the state of nature to be one of idyllic felicity. Primitive man was unfettered by the shackles of authority and free to live without being bound by artificial bonds of human laws. But, as the members of the race increase, this primitive condition is found to be disadvantageous in many respects. So the men of the community contracted themselves out of the natural state into a civil state. Unlike Hobbes, Rousseau does not suggest that it is fear which drives men to quit the state of nature, but he does say that it is man's weakness which makes him social. Whereas Hobbes holds that pride is natural to man, Rousseau holds that it is artificial.

Hobbes says that war prevails among men in the state of nature because of men's pride. Rousseau says that war is a product of conflict about property and therefore cannot exist in the state of nature where there is no property. In the state of nature of Rousseau, man was activated by impulse and not reason. The law of nature was based on instinct and sociability was the result of feeling and not reason. But the Law of nature in Locke's state of nature did not represent natural impulse but a moral law, based upon reason, to regulate human conduct. In the state of nature of Hobbes there is no civil law. Law of nature regulated human action.

In Hobbes, the purpose of the contract is to secure the protection of life, in Locke and Rousseau, the purpose is not only the protection of life alone, but also a more full and secure enjoyment of the natural rights and liberties than was possible in the state of nature. By a social contract, 'Hobbes' individual gives up all his rights except one i.e., right of defence and self preservation to a common sovereign. Locke's individual, on the other hand, surrenders some but not all his rights. Rousseau's contract is one between individuals in their personal capacity and individuals in their corporate capacity. The individuals in their individual capacity surrender all rights to the individuals as a corporate whole.

Rousseau seems to be entirely at one with Hobbes when he says that under the pact by which men enter into civil society every one makes a total alienation of all his rights. However, it must be remembered that Rousseau regarded this alienation as a form of advantageous exchange. Men give up their natural rights in exchange for civil

rights. The total alienation is followed by a total restitution and the bargain is a good one because what men surrender are rights of dubious value, unlimited by anything but by the individual's own powers, rights which are precarious and without a moral basis; in return men acquire rights that are limited but legitimate and invincible. They surrender the rights based on might, the rights they acquire are rights based on law.

It might be supposed that Rosseau is contradicting Locke when he says that men alienate all their rights when they make the social contract. Locke has said that men make the social contract only to preserve their rights. But Rousseau is really thinking in different terms from Locke. Rousseau does not think that men have in the state of nature the kind of natural rights which Locke supposed – the right, to property for example. For Rousseau there is only possession in the state of nature. Property comes into being only when law comes into being. Nor does Rousseau think, like Locke, of liberty as one of men's right. Indeed he says quite as emphatically as Locke that men cannot alienate their liberty. If Locke and Rousseau were thinking in the same terms, it would be a contradiction for Rousseau to say, as he does, that the social contract entails the total alienation of rights, and that man cannot alienate their liberty. In truth, what Rousseau is saying is that instead of surrendering their liberty, by the social contract, they convert their liberty from independence into political and moral freedom and this is part of their transformation from the creature's living brutishly according to impulse into men living humanly according to reason and conscience.

For both Hobbes and Rousseau there is only one contract, a social contract proper, but the consequential bodies of this contract are different. In Hobbes it is the sovereign government and in Rousseau it is the sovereign society. In the former the state is incorporated in Government, in the latter the state inheres in society. Both Hobbes and Rousseau agree that the people make a complete surrender of all their rights, but because of the nature of the contract, Rousseau says that his individual remains as free as he was in the state of nature while that of Hobbes becomes a bonded slave of the fearful Leviathan.

In the discussion of liberty, Rousseau's whole emphasis is different from Locke's. Locke is not worried, as Rousseau is by corruption and he does not hanker after virtue. Locke thinks that a system of positive law set up by constitutional state can enlarge men's liberty, but he also thinks that many systems of positive law do diminish men's liberty. For Locke there are good laws and bad laws. Good laws are ones that recognize and defend men's natural rights, bad laws are ones that neglect or abuse those rights. And therefore for Locke the problem is to have positive laws that secure men's rights and avoid laws that imperil men's liberty. But Rousseau has two distinctive approaches to law. When he is speaking of law as right, a law for him, is by definition just and even when he characterizes a law as an expression of the general will it is still by definition righteous. Secondly, when Rousseau is thinking about the kinds of law he sees in the real world, he is thinking as an empirical social scientist; he notes that all actual systems of Law can be seen to be unjust. Thus laws, as he explains them in the Social Contract, are rules made by a people in

their capacity as sovereign and obeyed by the same people in their capacity as subject.

Rousseau borrows from Hobbes the argument that sovereignty is an absolute power; it cannot be divided and remain sovereign; it cannot be subject to "Fundamental Laws". At the same time Rousseau take from Locke the notion that sovereignty is limited. Sovereignty is absolute but not unlimited. Hobbes makes no distinction between government, state and society. Rousseau differentiates between state and government and in it he agrees with Locke and both of them limit the power of the government. But in actual practice Rousseau's sovereign is as absolute as the sovereign of Hobbes. As one writer puts it, Rousseau's sovereign is Hobbes' sovereign with its head chopped off. "Whoever refuses to obey the General Will shall be compelled to do so by the whole body" according to Rousseau. But at the same time Rousseau's concept of General Will tends to the notion of direct democracy as it is unrepresentable.

Locke does not conceive of a sovereign state. The inherent right of man to life, liberty and property, presents a limitation on government. For Rousseau the people are the sovereign. Sovereignty resides in the general will of the people. The characteristics of this sovereignty are its unity, indivisibility, permanence, inalienability and its absolute and unrepresentable character. In Locke the government is a trustee and forms a part of the whole scheme of the contract, while in Rousseau government is the result of the enactment of the sovereign and is dependent on the sovereign people. Rousseau

distinguished between the sovereign, state and subordinate government.

Locke concedes the right of the people to change the government only in extreme cases. Rousseau, on the other hand, holds this right to be continuously exercised by the people. In both Locke and Rousseau, the people are the sovereign but while in Locke sovereignty is held in reserve, the government being authorized to act on its behalf for limited purposes, in Rousseau sovereignty is in continual exercise resulting in the discovery and formulation of the General Will. In Locke there is no surrender of the individual's rights, but only a conditional delegation of them. Hence Locke's theory implies two contracts one for the formation of the state and the other for that of government to which it also becomes a part. Rousseau by cutting off the idea of governmental compact from the contract theory made the state absolute. Rousseau has drawn heavily from the writing of Hobbes and Locke and has tried to reach the conclusions of one basing himself on the premises of the other. In the ultimate analysis it is to such a sovereign that Rousseau had also come with his General Will and its attributes. Hence, in Hobbes and Rousseau the individual becomes submerged in the Sovereign. The Doctrine of General Will went counter to the extreme individualism of Locke and made Rousseau drift towards an organic conception of society.

7.14 Summary:

Rousseau belongs to the philosophical school and not to the historical school of political philosophy. Many of the arguments of

Rousseau are based on the 'second treatise on government' of Locke. Rousseau's theory promoted union ship and solidarity in the state. Rousseau was not exactly original in his ideas but he used the old ideas for new use. Rousseau emphasized that the people are the ultimate source of political authority, and the government; the governments is just an agent.

Rousseau has very much influenced the later political thoughts. In France Rousseau's ideas of liberty, equality and sovereignty led to the Revolution of 1789. Napoleon once said that without Rousseau there would not have been the French Revolution. In America the theory of social contract played a conspicuous part. It was recognized in the Independence declaration of America and also the Bill of Rights.

7.15 Key words:

Sovereignty, Omnipotent, General will, Political Society, Natural Rights, Fraternity

7.16 Answers for CYP Question :

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 7.5

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 7.9

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 7.10

Question No.4 – Refer Paragraph No. 7.12

Question No.5 - Refer Paragraph No. 7.13

7.17 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought: A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.

2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, London Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D. Geminio. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chicago, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medieval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

7.18 Model Questions

1. Analyze the contributions of Rousseau to the theory of social contract.
2. Bring out the features of the General will of Rousseau.
3. Compare the ideas of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau on the concept of State of Nature and Sovereignty.
4. Compare the ideas of Locke and Rousseau on the concept of liberty and revolution
5. Compare the ideas of Locke and Rousseau on sovereignty and individual liberty.

Unit – 8

JOHN STUART MILL (1806 - 1873)

Introduction

J. S. Mill was born in London in 1807. J. S. Mill was at first an indiscriminate propagandist of Benthamite thinking. Educated by his father James Mill, he underwent in his youth a narrow crisis, which nearly destroyed him. It is said that it was an emotional starvation. He was relieved from it after the death of his father. He was very much influenced by the works of Wordsworth and Coleridge. J. S. Mill was partially converted to transcendentalism of Carlyle. But later he found that ethics and politics as more and more pessimistic and turned towards the doctrine of reduction of the world.

At the age of fifteen itself he read Bentham and attracted by the utilitarian theory. In 1823, he got an appointment in the East India Company. He was posted in the office of Examiner of India correspondence immediately under his father. In 1856 he joined the department and in 1858 he retired. He was a regular contributor to journals namely Morning Chronicle and Westminster Review. Apart from Wordsworth and Coleridge, J. S. Mill was influenced very much by Mrs. Taylor. In 1851, she became his wife. Mill says that he was having high wisdom, his talent and character. He lost his wife in 1859. After this he was totally engaged himself in writing. His works became immortal. He was elected as a Member of Parliament for West Minister. Later in 1868 he got defeated. He spent his life with his stepdaughter Helen Taylor. He died at Avignon in France 1873.

Objectives

- To define Mill's view on property, Labouring class, Socialist & Women Right.
- To study the concept of individuals according to Mill
- To explain Mill's views on Utilitarianism
- To explain Mill's Political ideas on Representation Govt.
- To analyze Mill's ideas on Liberty.

Unit Structure :

- Works of Mill
- Property
- Labouring Class
- Socialism
- Women's Rights
- Individualism
- Mill on Utilitarianism
- Mill's Political ideas, Representative Government
- Mill on Liberty
- Summary
- Key Words
- Books for further Reading
- Model Question

8.1 Works of Mill

When Mill stayed at the India House he used his leisure properly. His publications are, system of logic 1843, and in 1848 principles of Political Economy, which proved him as a great economist. Mill's, 'On liberty' appeared in 1859. Representative government and Unitarianism were published in 1861 and 1865 respectively. He released his father's analysis of Human Mind in the year 1869. In the same year 'On the subject of Women' was also

released. After his death, his autobiography and Essays on Nature, religion and theism were published in 1874.

James Mill and Bentham said that pleasures differ only in quantity. But J. S. Mill could not accept this. He brought a distinction between quality and quantity of pleasures. He gives more importance to quality of pleasure. According to J. S. Mill there are higher pleasures and lower pleasures. This is a departure from Benthamism. J. S. Mill and Spencer gave finishing touches to the utilitarian doctrines. Mill modified some of the basic tenets.

8.2 Property

Mill said that property is a social institution necessary for the progress of making. The individual is entitled to use his own faculties to produce whatever he can and he must have the right to bequeath what is his own to another, who in turn has the right to accept and enjoy it. The right to property is subject to several limitations such as the existence of children whom the father has to maintain. Mill justifies the private property in land subject to certain conditions. In the last years of his life Mill said the state should be the sole owner of land.

8.3 Labouring Class

Mill was very much interested in the labouring class. He laid emphasis on their education and pleaded for justice and self government for them. He was for planned families, a neo-malthusian. He was for moral restraints and a puritan. He further welcomed artificial means to limit the size of families.

8.4 Socialism

First he was opposed to socialism, but after much study and meditation, he saw virtue in it. But he had no sympathy for extreme socialism. He was for competition for successful trade. He never advocated materialization of land. He encouraged trade unionism. His socialism was sometimes like guild socialism, but it was utopian. He welcomed Factory Acts and insurance against sickness, accidents and old age. He took active part in the movement for land reforms. Still, with all this he was individualistic. He was for some state control of industries but at the same time against state interference in economic affairs. He wanted the liberty of the individual to be protected.

8.5 Women's Rights

He demanded certain rights for women. He wanted the removal of gross inequalities and disabilities of women. Exclusion of Women from high office in society is unjust. He stressed the need for speedy and full emancipation of woman. His efforts made women to get higher education in Great Britain.

8.6 Individualism

He wanted free scope for the development of the intellectual and moral qualities of the individual. Otherwise there will be no progress. He opposed state education, as it would kill the originality. He pleaded for freedom of thought, speech and action. As a social being he should be controlled but not completely. Like Lord Action

**CYP
Question**
1. Write a
short note
on
individualis
m

he believed in progress and progress depends on innovation, and innovation is always the work of an individual. He therefore wanted complete liberty for experimentation.

In the economic field, Mill was for state action in the interest of social welfare. He always kept before himself the aims of promotion of social welfare, and preservation of individuality. As a good utilitarian, he wanted happiness as the ultimate standard of all human conduct and regarded freedom as a vital necessity. The individual should desire and promote general happiness. Unlike Bentham he said society itself has a moral end and moral goodness of its members.

8.7 Mill on Utilitarianism

J. S. Mill, while seeking to defend utilitarianism from the anti hedonist movement led by Carlyle, modified some of its basic tenets. Bentham had emphasized that there could only be quantitative differences between various pleasures, but no qualitative differences. This actually produced a severe criticism of the utilitarian distinctions between pleasures. Mill wanted to avoid this criticism by importing a difference between higher quality pleasure and lower quality pleasure, Bentham has contended that ‘quantity of pleasure being equal, pushpin is as good as poetry’. According to Mill, there cannot be any quantitative measurement of pleasures. Mill truly reflects human experience when he says “It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied, better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. And if the fool or the pig is of a different opinion it is because they only know their side of the question. The other party to the comparison known both sides Mill was surely right. But he was

**Answer
for CYP
Question**
2. Explain
the Mill's
views on
Utilitarianism

obviously opposed to the main current of utilitarian thought". If there is a note pleasure, and another less noble pleasure, Mill advocates the pursuit of the former. But if human beings want to attain the higher pleasure discarding the lower ones, they are not really acting according to the principle of utility as propounded by Bentham. To prove his point that the principle of utility can admit a qualitative distinction of pleasures, Mill further states that pleasures cannot be objectively measured. He says that the "felicific calculus is absurd and men have always relied upon the testimony of those most competent or judge". There is no other tribunal to be referred to even on the question of quantity. What means are there of determining what is the acutest of two pleasurable sensations except the general suffrage of those who are familiar with both? This argument destroys yet another foundation of utilitarianism.

Mill also firmly asserts that individuals should aim at self realization. He attaches the highest importance to the 'dignity of men'. If this dignity is to be preserved, and respected, men cannot pursue those pleasures which impinge on that dignity and hinder the self realization. Men must not simply remain immersed in pleasures, they must aim at good life consistent with the dignity of men and the cardinal objective of realizing the best self. According to Mill, therefore, men must work for a moral end and not simply for pleasures. This trend of thought is entirely absent in Bentham for whom utility is the supreme goal. To Mill the promotion of individual virtue and the dignity of man constitute the final objectives of human life. Because of the difference between Bentham and Mill, there arises a difference in their conceptions of what constitutes man's

moral obligation. Bentham thinks that man interprets the moral obligation in the light of his selfish desires and past experience and future expectations play a vital role in the formation of these desires. Mill however is not prepared to attach supreme importance to selfishness or fear moulded by associations and circumstances; self effacement, love for neighbors, religious considerations, feelings and sympathy, all play their part in determining man's moral obligation. Bentham's doctrine, therefore is transformed in the hands of J.S. Mill who refuses to believe that the principle of utility can give rise to or explain man's moral obligation.

Mill also deviates from the orthodox tenets of utilitarianism in as much as he considers liberty to be a more fundamental objective than the principle of utility. Liberty cannot be justified simply in terms of utility, its importance to the individual and to the society is much more fundamental. If at all liberty is to be justified in terms of the principle of utility, Mill would provide a new definition of utility, utility stands for the permanent interests that human beings must promote for the sake of continuous progress. In this way the original Benthamite conception of utility stands modified. Without liberty, says Mill, men cannot make the most of their moral and intellectual capabilities, they cannot realize their best selves.

In advocating liberty for the individual, Mill upholds the principle of non-interference. Individual liberty must not encounter any interference except for the sake of preventing an individual from causing injury to other. Once again, Mill is invoking the principle of

self development of individuals in order to uphold the doctrine of non-interference.

Mill also differs from Bentham in his defence of the representative form of government. Bentham assumes that human beings are essentially selfish and, therefore, unless there is a democracy, the ruling class will only promote their own interest. Mill agrees that in the absence of a democracy, the rulers may be more inclined to neglect the interest of the people. But he does not take it for granted that all men in all countries are able to run successfully their democratic institutions. Bentham believes that his doctrine can be applied universally whereas Mill affirms, that differences in circumstances and traditions might necessitate different prescriptions for different communities. While Bentham advocates democracy under all circumstances, Mill is afraid that the people lacking certain qualities would be unfit to maintain the democratic form of government.

Mill does not believe that social happiness would automatically result from the pursuit of individual happiness. The strength and capacity of all men are not equal. The environment of men keeps them unequal. The legal system, for example, does not serve all persons equally, only a few can extract the greatest benefit from the legal system. In order to do way with the evils of unequal competition. Mill would recommend active state measures which would eliminate hindrances to the individuals' self-development. He advocates state assistance for improving the lot of the masses. He wants that the state should legislate to regulate the conditions of

factory labour, especially with regard to child labour. He is also in favour of limited working hours. The state should provide compulsory education and spend tax-proceeds for that purpose. Mill is thus altering Benthamism which has abundant faith in laissez faire and does not foresee the necessity of state intervention for the sake of bettering the lot of the masses. It can be argued that by advocating state intervention for the promotion of general happiness, mill is becoming a true utilitarian. But it is obvious that he is introducing changes in the doctrines laid down by Bentham.

Now let us assess the importance of the modifications made by Mill to the Benthamite doctrine of utilitarianism. Mill's inclusion of qualitative consideration is highly controversial. Neither qualitative nor quantitative pleasure can be assessed. Again, Mill's argument that every individual's happiness is good by itself and, therefore, the general happiness is for the good of the aggregate of all men is a misleading statement. Here Dr. Wayper says, "For men can only desire happiness which alone is good, it must follow that whatever men desire is good. This is to abolish the notion of goodness altogether for, if an addition cannot be bad, it certainly cannot be good". Though Mill advocated universal suffrage, yet his advocacy of plurality of votes destroyed altogether the purpose of universal suffrage. In the words of Brown, "He softened away the crudities of Benthamite ethics and in so doing he made utilitarianism at once more humane and less inconsistent". In his revision of Benthamism, Mill was influenced by the collectivism of the idealist school.

His dichotomy of self-regarding and other regarding conduct must be appreciated. As a champion of individual liberty, he equals Milton, Voltaire, Rousseau and Paine. C. L. Wayper calls him a reluctant democrat. According to him, “ In his On Liberty and Representative Government, Mill shows himself very distrustful of democracy, yet he is both a democrat and the greatest of English writers on democracy. No one has insisted more vigorously that it is not suitable for all people. But one has been more convinced that where it is possible, it is the best of all government”.

Mill’s political thought lacks coherence and consistency. He has often been contradictory. He entertained conflicting views on issues. Yet, according to Wayper, with all the criticisms that can be brought against him, he remains far and away the most satisfactory of the utilitarian. He was indeed a great and real democrat who understood fully the value of human personality and development of the individuals as a social being.

8.8 Mill’s Political ideas, Representative Government

Mill believed that the political institution grows, but at every stage of their growth they must be adjusted to the capacities and qualities of men who operate them. Every good government must have certain characteristics. Namely:

1. It must promote the virtue and intelligence of the people.
2. The right to vote should be extended to women.
3. Voting should be open and not secret except under exceptional circumstances.

CYP Question 3. Define Reprehen sive Governm ent
--

4. The power to approve or disapprove must be in the hands of the people.

This does not mean that the people should have a share in the administration of a country. Administration with the intricacies and complexities is beyond the capacity of even the most intelligent and virtuous people or the Assembly. So a Representative Assembly has only to watch and control the government to throw light on its acts, to compel a full exposition and justification of all their acts, to ensure them, if found guilty of crimes, to expel them from office, if they abuse the trust kept in them and to appoint successors". So the Representative Assembly does not perform legislative and administrative functions, it merely supervises the activities of the officers. Mill thus was interested in concrete institutions.

According to Mill human beings are selfish. Unless there is democracy the ruling class will only promote their own interest. In the absence of democracy, the ruling class will neglect the interests of the people. The best form of government is the one in which the sovereignty is vested in the community in the last resort.

The essential characteristic of this government is "the whole people or some numerous portion of them, exercise, through their deputies periodically elected by themselves, the ultimate controlling power which in every constitution, must reside somewhere". The ultimate power they must possess in all completeness. They must be masters of all operations of government.

The analysis shows that according to Mill representative government is democratic government.

Mill was alive to the dangers and weaknesses of democracy and he tried to provide against them and to counteract them.

He was interested in minorities and against tyranny of the majority over the minorities. Minorities also have rights and interests. If the voice of the minorities is not heard, their democracy cannot function in a healthy and satisfactory condition. He suggested proportional representation to secure adequate representation of minorities. He preferred Proportional Representation by the single transferable vote. The essence of democracy is equality. He did not recognize the various defects of proportional representation.

Mill advocated plurality of votes for the highly educated citizens, and those who had virtue in them. He wanted extension of franchise to all interests, opinions and grades of intellect and to men as well as women. No class should dominate the legislature otherwise democracy is not ideally the best form of government.

Critics consider that Mill's ideas are outmoded. Today we find Mill's fears of dangers of democracy were real. Democracy is dominated by pressure groups, demagoguism, bossism and pressure politics. There is general ignorance and incapacity in democracy. After all Mill was right in his fears.

8.9 Mill on Liberty

Two political ideas of J.S. Mill make an important milestone on the road to liberalism of which John Locke was the founding father. During the intervening centuries the problems facing the liberal philosophy had radically changed. In the middle of the 19th century due to the utilitarian reform the scope of administrative activities increased. Parliament became the supreme law making authority and from time to time passed such laws, which obstructed individual liberty. But every British Citizen was becoming politically conscious. They demanded universal franchise. According to Davidson, “deeply impressed with the fact that social and political progress depends largely on the originality and energy of the individual, and not less concerned with the tendency of democracy to swamp the individual in general, Mill stood as the advocate-in-chief of individuality”.

On Liberty was a strong plea for the liberty of thought, expression and action against legislative interference as well as against the pressure of public opinion. Mill feared that the growth of democracy and the increasing legislative power of the state tended to reduce individuals to a common type and to swamp them in the tyranny of collectivism. He believed in the development of his personality. He believed in the toleration of opinions and unhampered freedom of discussion. He had confidence that truth would survive in the struggle of ideas. Only joining complementary aspects together and doing full justice to each other one can reach the correct view. “If all mankind” Mill argues, minus one were of one opinion, and only one person, than be, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind’. Mill, thus, argues in favour of freedom of

opinion and freedom of expression of an opinion on the plea that no one is infallible and the opinion sought to be suppressed may well be true.

As for liberty of actions, those actions, which are likely to harm others, may be controlled by society. But “in things which do not primarily concern others, individuality should assert itself”. Mill tried to divide men’s actions into two: other-regarding actions which government was fully entitled to control because they affected the lives of other people and self-regarding actions which affected only the agent himself and should therefore be regarded inviolable. By insisting on non-interference in self-regarding action, Mill takes a non-utilitarian view because he stresses on self-development.

In olden days, according Mill, “the aim of patriots was to set limits to the power which the ruler should be suffered to exercise over the community, and this limitation was that they meant by liberty. Their struggle for liberty was waged in two ways, first by obtaining political rights, liberties and immunities from the king, secondly, by establishing constitutional checks on his power, for which the consent of the circumstances changed, people ceased to think that their government should be an independent power opposed in interest to themselves. They realized the need to appoint political officers of the state who would be responsible to them. In this way alone, “the conflict between the rulers and the ruled would be eliminated. The delegation of power forms the basis of democratic government. As the rulers should be identified with the people, that interest and will should be the interest and will of the nation.

When people themselves become rulers, who is going to restrict their power or who would want this power to be limited? This is the essence of Mill's discussion of liberty.

Mill argues that there is a greater danger to liberty in a democratic republic. He points out that "the people who exercise the power are not always the same people as those over whom it is exercised" and the "self-government spoken of is not the government of each by himself but of each by all the rest". The will of the people would practically mean the will of the majority or those who succeed in making themselves accepted as the majority. These people may desire to oppress others. Society must be on its guard against the abuse of power by the majority. The 'tyranny of the majority' could be limited when the holders of power are made regularly accountable to the community.

A more serious danger to liberty is social tyranny. For "it leaves fewer means of escape, penetrating much more deeply into the details of life and enslaving the soul itself". Society has a tendency to impose its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who are opposed to them. An individual is helpless against this kind of social oppression, which reaches into personal affair, and forces him to become conformist.

Another type of social oppression is the force of social customs and rituals. The customs are established not by reason and usefulness of the society, but according to the likes and dislikes of the ruling

class. When the ruling class is on the decline, people reject not only its habit and preference but also the idea that some individuals are socially and politically superior. The all-embracing equality threatens to reduce everything to the same mediocre level. For people do not tolerate anyone who thinks and acts differently from them. Mill pleads for non-interference in the affairs of an individual. However, if a person tries to restrict the freedom of others he should not be allowed to do so. Further, one would be justified in preventing a man from harming himself. Mill says, "Liberty consists in doing what one desires, and one does not desire to fall into the river".

As Wayper points out this definition of liberty throws the door open to any amount of interference. "Mill has gone far towards admitting the extremist idealist contention that one can be forced to be free". Here again J.S. Mill deviates from Bentham.

Mill could not tolerate repression of individual liberty for the sake of a strong state. The value of a state is more than the value of the individuals composing it. Mill's choice between capitalism and socialism was based on the amount of human liberty that each of them was consistent with. Mill desired that property should be improved and every member of the community should be enabled to own property. He avoided taking any extreme position.

The crowing glory of Mill's argument for liberty, however, is the insistence that there can be no tyranny more terrible than the despotism of the dullards who are but the dupes of the ambitious and

the corrupt. He was wholesomely suspicious of “the collective mind of the race” which by large, is vacant. He preferred cranks to fools and the history of democracy vindicates Mill’s preference. He was an individualist, but he was an enlightened individualist. Bigotry was alien to his theory of liberty.

Thus seen it is wrong to say that Mill was the prophet of an empty liberty and an abstract individual. It is not negative in tone and content, it has some positive content. Thus he did not develop a theory of liberty for all, he applied it only to human beings in the maturity of their faculties. “Despotism”, he argues. “is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians provided the end be their improvement and the means justified by actually affecting that end. But still there remains that positive area of freedom where the arms of state do not reach freedom of opinion, freedom of expression of tastes, of pursuits and association.

8.10 Summary :

Mill’s introduction of qualitative consideration for pleasure is highly controversial. Pleasure cannot be assessed. His argument that general happiness is for the good of the aggregate of all men is a misleading statement. His advocacy of plurality of votes destroyed the purpose of universal suffrage. He made important changes in Benthamite ideas and made utilitarianism more humane and less inconsistent.

Mill lacked logical clarity. He said prohibition of sale of alcoholic liquor was an infringement of libety, but compulsory

education was not. Social legislation was necessarily a humanitarian growth. He was prepared to accept a large and well-defined regulation of business and industry in the interest of public health and welfare.

His economic theory was also deficient. He would not permit the police to punish a person for gambling, drunkenness or several immoralities. At the same time he permitted the use of the police force to flight the social consequences of these acts.

8.11 Key Words:

Westminster, Parliament, Laboring & Class, Women Rights, Utilitarian

8.12 Answers for CYP Question :

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 8.6

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 8.7

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 8.8

8.13 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, London Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
4. D. Geminio. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chicago, University of Chicago Press 1972.

5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medicval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

8.14 Model Question

1. Discuss Mill's views on Liberty.
2. Explain the Mill's act of utilitarianism
3. Evaluate the Mill's contribution to Political thought.

Unit – 9
Communist Thinkers
Karl Marx
(1818 - 1883)

Introduction

Karl Marx, the German philosopher and the most popular figure in the history of socialist thinking was born on 5th May 1818 in Prussia.

Marx studied in the universities of Bonn and Berlin. He studied history and philosophy of Epicures. At the age of 17th felt in love with an aristocratic girl, but because his and her parents were against it, he married his lover after seven years only.

He first sought career in journalism. He felt that academic philosophy is not offering solutions to economic problems. The economic questions were neglected. Marx went to France and came into contact with his life-long friend Engels. Engels was already a communist when Marx met him.

In the year 1845, Marx was expelled from Paris at the influence of the Prussian government. Marx went to Brussels. It 1848, he published the Communist Manifesto. It was his Communist Manifesto that gave him a position in the socialist movement.

Marxism is made up of three elements. 1. Dialectical and historical materialism 2. The Labour theory of value 3. The theory of state.

Objectives :

- To explain Karl Marx's views on dialectical and historical materialism.
- To define the Doctrine of surplus value according to Marx.
- To study the Marxist concept on the Theory of State.
- To the method of proletariat revolution by Marx
- To understand the nature of working of classes communist society.

Unit Structure

- Dialectical and Historical Materialism
- The Doctrine of Surplus Value
- The Theory of State
- The method of Proletariat Revolution
- It's Function
- Working of the classless communist society
- What is the nature of Lenin's Marxism?
- Lenin's treatment of Historical Materialism
- The Theory of State
- Lenin's theory about the method of revolution
- Dictatorship of the Proletariat
- Organization
- Function
- Internationalism and world Revolution
- Summary
- Key words
- Answers for CYP Question
- Books for further Reading
- Model Question

9.1 Dialectical and Historical Materialism

This is the vital thread on which the whole of “the communist Manifesto” hangs says Laski. Karl Marx was a revolutionary, eager to find a philosophy that would justify his determination to destroy capitalism and state by means of violent proletarian revolution. He found it in Hegel’s dialectic Idealism and transformed it into dialectic materialism.

According to Marx ‘Reality is Matter’. Matter for Marx is not necessarily unconscious matter, but whatever exists in the universe. The highest activity of reality is human activity, but fully human activity is that of man is society, of the collective man and not of the individual man. The individual is totally subordinate to the collective body.

Reality must attain inevitably the goal of a perfect society. This reality attains its goal by the dialectical process of thesis, antithesis and synthesis.

Marx considers the history of mankind as the application of dialectical materialism and hence calls his view of history as historical materialism or the materialistic interpretation of history. In this the significant element is the doctrine of economic determinism. It does not mean that man acts only from economic motives of material interest. He may act also according to other motives but these are subordinates to the primary economic motives. Every society is based on the prevailing productive conditions.

The modes of production depend on who owns and controls the means of production. They develop dialectically in the following order.

1. The primitive communistic form in which all men own in common the means of production. This is thesis.
2. The slave holding in which the slave-owners own the means. This is anti-thesis.
3. The feudal form in which the owners are primarily the kings, and secondarily the Lords and vassals, while the middle class like the artisans, tradesmen and so on are denied such ownership. This is Synthesis.
4. The capitalistic form in which the industrial capitalists own all the means of production, except the proletariat, whom they can compel to work, as they want. This is anti-thesis.

The socialist form in which the proletariat own in common the means of production, which by reducing all men to the rank of proletariat, will prepare the way for the advent of the immutable communistic form where all men are workers owning in common, all the means of production.

The productive relations are relations between men involved in production and they depend on the prevailing modes of production. Thus these relations are in they primitive communal form and in the final communistic form, whose of co-operation, but in all

others, those of irreconcilable hostility between those who own and control, and those who do not have the means of production.

Marx contends that every society that has existed so far and that will exist hereafter is based only on the prevailing production conditions. His reason is that the highest activity of man is the production and exchange of goods, for his subsistence. For the one object which all men seek and therefore governs all human relations, is this production and exchange of the means of livelihood.

Hence society is the first communal form and in the last communistic form of productive conditions is made up of only one class, but in all other forms of two classes, the haves and the have nots, who are perpetually at war with each other.

The production conditions constitute the economic substructure of a society the material basis upon which the superstructure of political institutions and laws is based and to which certain forms of political consciousness correspond' says Karl Marx. The state is the product of class struggle and becomes an instrument of class oppression, There is no state, no religion, and no idea of god and no morality in the primitive communal and the final communistic society.

Hence all changes in the superstructure have but one cause that is the change in their corresponding sub-structure of productive condition. The modes of production, owing to the operation of

dialectical materialism are in constant change bringing in a new economically dominant class. Since the substructure of productive conditions dialectically evolves, the superstructure of society will also evolve dialectically until the classless communist society is attained. To attain it mankind in every country should go through all the stages.

Such is the Marxian history of mankind. The laws of dialectical materialism operate rigidly on everyman and on every country. The great movements in history are ultimately due to only one cause, namely the change in the production conditions.

Marx believed that the French Revolution was a bourgeoisie revolution against the feudal Monarchy and Lords, and later he looked upon the Paris commune of 1871 as the establishment of the regime of the Proletariat.

Both Hegel and Marx view the course of history as a pattern of stages advancing towards a pre-determined goal. For Hegel history culminates in the rise of the German nation as the spiritual leader of Europe. For Marx, history is a warfare between the nations. For Marx it is a revolutionary struggle between classes.

Marxian dialectics is not wholly correct. Marxist claims that it constitutes the only scientific approach to reality cannot be accepted. This approach is not scientific at all. Marx's dialectic is no more revolutionary than that of Hegel. In Marx's society there will be only one class but this is not true. There will be other

classes besides that mentioned by Marx. The dictatorship of the proletariat of Marx is simply a myth.

9.2 The Doctrine of Surplus Value

The British classical economists in defence of capitalism held the view that the value of the commodity was determined only by the relative quantity of labour. The law of wages, the wages of the Industrial labourer depended on the laborer's cost of subsistence. Now Marx exploited these doctrines to expose eloquently the evolution, iniquity and destruction of capitalism.

**CYP
Question**
1. Define
the
principle
of
Surplus
value

According to Marx, the value of the commodity is fixed only by the industrial labourer's labour, while the value of this labour is the cost of subsistence. The industrial capitalist pays the labourer as wages only what is enough for his subsistence. He pockets the rest as profits which is actually the surplus value of the commodity due to the labour spent on it, and which really belong to the labour. By taking it himself, the capitalist exploits the labour. The capitalists, eager to fill up their profits enter into a mad competition with one another, accumulating more and more labour saving machinery workers are oppressed and starved. Thus the misery of the workers becomes more and more unbearable and there is for them no remedy but revolution.

9.3 The Theory of State

'Marxism is evolutionary and revolutionary'. The origin of state is merely accidental and artificial. It is the result of class struggle, and so does not exist in the primitive communal societies

and will not exist in the communist society, since these two forms of society are totally rid of class struggle.

Thus the production obsessed Marxian denies that the state is the inevitable product of the social nature of every man for his perfection.

Analyzing the nature of the state, the state is an instrument of oppression of one class by another. Hence it is a means for the welfare of the economically dominant class that has seized reigns of government. The other class is not to be a beneficiary, but only a victim of the state.

Marx's "state" is an utter stranger to all those beneficial function, which the right-minded philosophers and statesmen from the dawn of history up to our own days, demand of every state for the benefit not only of the economically prosperous but also of the economically downtrodden. For Marx 'State' does not know all those limitations which are imposed upon the government such as the fundamental rights of citizens, and the obligations that bind the governments to work devotedly and efficiently for the welfare of all the citizens, burying the inhuman policy of Laissez-faire. 'State' is not something 'given' in human relationship as the role of father is 'given' by nature.

When does the Proletarian revolution take place? It is only after the establishment of a full-fledged capitalism. Capitalists have to act as the foster mother of the proletariat for because they develop the means of communication throughout the country,

which will quicken the unity of the worker throughout the country and politically they establish parliamentary form of government and to placate the disgruntled labourers, they allow them to send some representatives to the parliament and thus they train the workers to be united.

The Capitalists create oneness among the workers. Thus capitalism has within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

Hence the inevitable conclusion of Marx that in feudal and backward countries, the workers should first hasten the advent of capitalism, even though thereby their misery will increase many fold. But towards the end of his life Marx shocked his Russian disciples and others by his stating an exception that Russia though still feudal, could straightaway start a proletarian revolution without passing through the fires of capitalism. Marx made this exception not as a normal part of his system. He merely tolerated it. Another important contention of Marx, that it was not at all possible for setting up of socialism in anyone country independently of revolution in other countries. He was for international revolution to be started simultaneously all over Europe, if not all over the world at once.

9.4 The method of Proletariat Revolution

In the Communist Manifesto he advocated in accordance with his doctrine of class struggle, a violent revolution of the workers of all countries, but later on he advocated for the advanced countries evolutionary methods that is education and organization of

<p>CYP Question 2. Explain the method of proletariat revolution</p>

political parties of workers. Hence the follower of Marx came to be split into two schools namely revolutionaries and evolutionary. The proletariat after their successful revolution should set up the dictatorship of the proletariat and their state is called a socialist society.

9.5 It's Function

It should set up a socialist society in which they own the instruments of production in common and whose characteristic note is 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs'. Marx had laid down in detail all the measures to be adopted for the destruction of capitalism in advanced countries.

The proletariat rule is different because it is the very antithesis of bourgeoisie democracy. Engel's says that it should be organized on the model of the Paris Commune of 1871. Hence a commune or assembly elected only by the workers and exercising legislative, executive and judicial powers must run the government. Public officials should be paid at the same rate as the manual worker. There must be an armed people and not a standing army, and there should be also free public education.

Marx often emphasized that the Paris commune supplied the basis of really democratic institutions and that nothing could be more foreign to the spirit of the commune than to supersede universal suffrage by hierarchical investiture. The organs of government are not over and above the proletariat and in and out of the proletariat. The workers are fully sovereign over the elected assembly. This is the reason why their electors could recall the

elected representative. Marx was for the dictatorship of the party. For him the mass of workers, under the rigorous operation of dialectical materialism will spontaneously of their own accord, and by their non co-operation and direction and revolt smash the capitalists. Therefore there should be no rule by any party or clique. But Marx explicitly affirms that the communist party should be the only vanguard of the working class. So both Marx and Engels did not conceive the dictatorship of the proletariat to mean the dictatorship of the communist party.

During the dictatorship of the proletariat which is only transitional towards classless society, “the state wither away” says Engels.

9.6 Working of the classless communist society

‘From each according to his ability to each according to his need’ is the motto. It is a paradise on earth, it is a paradise of freedom for all men. The opposition between intellectual and manual labours has vanished. Labour has become not only a means to live but also the biggest need of life. Marx called his manifesto as ‘communist’ because he considered all the hitherto taught socialist ideas as vague and utopian. But critics say the Marx’s ideas is not clear. There is no question of patriotism for the worker. The workers and their country work under the merciless and impartial operation of the laws of dialectical materialism in the same way as men and courtiers elsewhere Marx is an international to the core. This is evident from his appeal “Workers of the World, Unite”.

<p>CYP Question 3. Explain the Marx views on classes society</p>
--

9.7 Summary

The work of Marx is undoubtedly an epoch in the history of Social and Political philosophy and also in the history of the 20th century world. His claim for greatness rests on grounds other than intellectual originality. He has combined Hegelian philosophy with the English classical economics and the French sociology. Marx highly condemned the then prevailing mass of capitalistic iniquity and avarice. Marx further discussed that how the victims of the capitalist system should traverse the road to a perfectly satisfactory society. So his philosophy would be for the worker of a movement. Marx in his righteousness indignation against the capitalists, has over stepped the limits and given a philosophy of hatred and expects wonders from it, for all humanity. Laski calls Kari Marx the head and center of destructive forces of Europe.

According to Marx, religion is the opium of mankind. The Universal belief in some kind of supreme being and in some kind of continuance of life after death and the arguments by many a philosopher of different religions and races in favour of those doctrines are dismissed by Marx. He neither cares to know what those arguments are, nor takes the faintest trouble to disprove them.

Kari Marx exaggerates historical Materialism. It is impossible to agree with Marx that the conditions of productions and exchange alone ultimately determine the history of mankind. Marx's doctrine is untrue. Marx has over simplified the issue.

The theory of class war is rejected by real history and by sound philosophy. The theory that states are merely agents of exploitation is essentially the propaganda of a revolutionary minority; it is not a theory on which any government in power can operate.

False has been the prophecy of Marx that capitalism would necessarily and dialectically increase the misery of the Proletariat and reduces to the rank of the proletariat the small capitalists and middle classes. The classless communistic society is a utopia. It is a myth designed only to help a revolutionary theory and party.

LENIN

Introduction:

Lenin applied Marxism to the needs of Russia. He is the founder of the Third International and the first militant Pontiff of Russian communism. Ofcourse he always professed an unwavering adherence to Marxism. He was essentially not a thinker, but a man of action, a revolutionary bent on guiding his revolutionary followers on the path of revolution, against Tzardom and all capitalism. Hence he would interpret his Master to suit and justify his own purpose.

Lenin was born in 1870, in Simbirsk on the Volga River. He belonged to a middle class or rather moderately prosperous family. Lenin was the third child in a family of seven. Lenin and his elder brother Alexander are very close with each other, or very much attached to one another. Both of them have excellent and brilliant

academic career. Both of them used to secure highest marks. This was the period when the reformist Tsar Alexander II in 1881 was assassinated. His successor was Alexander III. He was an absolutist and of Russian rulers. Lenin was a man of independent thinking, will and determination. He wanted to emancipate Russia from the rulers of Russia. Lenin felt that communist society could be inaugurated in Russia only after the end of stardom and the abolition of capitalistic state of economy.

Objectives:

- To understand the nature of Lenin's Marxism.
- To study Lenin's treatment of Historical Materialism
- To explain the ideas of Lenin on the Theory of State.
- To analyze the Lenin's theory about the Method of revolution.

9.8 What is the nature of Lenin's Marxism?

Lenin gives three interpretations

1. It is reversal form Marx's later revolutionary creed to the earlier revolutionary one.
2. It is an adoption of Marxism to the conditions in Russia.
3. It is "Marxism of the era of imperialism and of the Proletariat revolution"

9.9 Lenin's treatment of Historical Materialism

Lenin admits the philosophy of Marxism, Dialectical and Historical materialism without any reservation and he himself has stated that religions are the opium of the people.' Lenin introduced certain important modifications. Up to 1916, he admitted that industrial capitalism would lead straight to socialism. But in the same year he was horrified by the pangs of the long war, and modified Marx's and contended that the industrial capitalism would lead to socialism only through capitalist imperialism or financial capitalism.

Industrial Capitalism Lenin said that, prospered during 1789-1871 and its inherent contradictions produced "the moribund state of capitalism" during 1871-1913, when the monopolistic organisation of big banks and other financial groups of Western Europe, for the sake of exploitation, divided the undeveloped countries among themselves according to nationalities. This ruthless exploitation for profits would lead the differences in the volume of exploitation and necessarily war should break out, which will bring to an end all exploitation of all capitalism, industrial and financial.

The war of 1914-1918 was of this type-capitalist struggle between the syndicates of the German finance capitalists and their subsidiaries and the syndicates of the British French and Allied Finance capitalists, for the control of Africa and for the division of loot.

This economic development of capitalism to imperialism and war could not but, on the marxisian principle, affect the class struggle. The period 1789-1871 was an ascending curve said Sabine, for the bourgeoisie, was progressed economically and politically over their former enemies, the feudal aristocracy, and who received the support of Proletariat.

The period between 1871-1913 'was the flat top of the curve in which there was kind of backlash in the class struggle. "said Sabine, for a small but influential worker in the metropolitan countries, in return for higher wages, took up the cause of their masters against the workers at home and abroad, and thereby helped to unite all these oppressed masses. The war of 1914 was the next stage. The Bourgeoisie had by now become a decaying race. They were not in production , but only in consumption. Hence there could beno more alliance between them and the proletariat which should not unite and start the revolution by violence and destroy imperialism.

Lenin did not admit the inherent capacity of mass of the workers to start the revolution by themselves. He was always convinced that, without a party, centralized and well disciplined, the workers could neither become revolutionary nor start a revolution because masses can spontaneously become trade unionists and not socialists.

9.10 The Theory of State

Lenin admitted Marx's idea of State as being the result of class struggle and the instrument of class oppression but he had made a

**CYP
Question**
4.
Explain
the
theory of
state

number of changes concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat and revolution.

Lenin had a theory as to when the proletariat revolution would occur. For a very long time up to nearly the middle of 1917. Russia being still predominantly feudal, the workers should help the capitalists to set up the regime of the capitalists, even though they would have to suffer thereby. Hence in April 1917 when he returned to his country from his exile, he looked upon the Revolution of the previous month and the subsequent expulsion of the Tsar and the establishment of the provisional government as the achievements of the capitalists. Soon after Lenin started talking in a different way.

He said, "All power belongs not to provisional government, but to the soviets-rural and urban". This was his battle cry. He called upon the workers and peasants to unite and began straightaway a socialist revolution, and hailed "as truly proletariat and socialist", his own almost bloodless revolution, by which he seized power on November, 7th 1917.

Surely this is reversal of the strict view of Marx. But Lenin protested the essential accord between his view and Marx's and appealed to the theory of "living Marxism" and to his own theory of Capitalist Imperialism.

Living Marxism means to Lenin that it is necessary to acquire the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognizance of living life of the true facts of reality, and must not continue clinging to the

theory of yesterday, which, like every other theory, only outlines the general, not embracing the complete life. According to the old conception, the rule of the proletariat and peasantry can and must follow the rule of the bourgeoisie. In real life, however, things have already turned out otherwise.

Lenin admitted Marx's view that Russia should undertake a proletariat revolution only at the same time as the revolution in the west. Hence he all along had the firm conviction that the Russian Revolution, has taken place in the absence of revolution in the west. He was sure that such revolution should soon burst out, for the western countries had been greatly weakened by their competition for exploitation and by the excessive waste and disorder of the war. Lenin argues that they were fully ripe for a socialistic revolution.

9.11 Lenin's theory about the method of revolution

Marx taught the revolutionary method for advanced countries and for the backward countries. Lenin was only for the revolutionary method anywhere and everywhere. Without a violent revolution the substitution of a proletarian for the capitalist state is impossible. All task of the peaceful democratic piece – meal change is an illusion, for the reason that capitalists control all the vehicles of information and make it impossible for the worker to elect majorities to the Parliament.

**CYP
Question**
5. What are
the
methods of
revolution

9.12 Dictatorship of the Proletariat

Like Marx, Lenin understood by this dictatorship 'the Power won and maintained by the Proletariat against the bourgeois power in a manner unrestricted by laws'. But Lenin said that "A True Marxist

is one who accepts Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat. The essence of Marxism lies in this. But Lenin gives his views on the organization and function of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

9.13 Organization

Lenin set up throughout the country, a number of Soviets elected only by the elections directly or indirectly and Hierarchically arranged, with the all Russian Congress of Soviets as the highest governmental authority, legislative, executive and judicial. He considered the soviets not “mere talking groups” like the bourgeois Parliaments, but “working bodies”. Thus throughout his regime, he admitted Marxist principles that the workers are sovereign and had the right to recall their representatives at their will.

The question is, did Lenin admit the supremacy of the workers or Soviets in practice. At first he admitted Marx’s view of the inherent capacity of the workers to govern their state through the Soviets, and his own personal opinion was that administration meant only counting and control’, which did not call for experts. After the disaster of the three years of ‘war communism’ (1917 – 1920), for the government were nothing but a mass of inefficiency, Lenin understood that an organized and well-disciplined party was necessary for the organization and functioning of government and for the education of the masses in the socialist spirit. Hence Lenin decided that the actual government must be run directly not by the Soviets through these must continue, but by the Party, the Communist party whose duty however is to led, but not to dominate the Soviets. Since the workers alone constitute the state’, it is no more necessary that

there should be two political parties than that a man should have two heads. The Communist party is the highest form of the Proletariat class organization. The Proletariat democracy is not inconsistent with discipline of the worker enforced by a democratically centralized party.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat alone is democracy, pure simple and genuine. Bourgeois democracy is false and hypocritical, a paradise for the rich, and a snare and deception for the poor. Proletarian democracy is a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy, and the soviet government is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic, thought Lenin.

9.14 Function

Like Marx, Lenin looked upon the rule of the proletariat as an essential instrument for the elimination of capitalism. Lenin calls their state as 'bourgeois state without the bourgeoisie'.

Lenin's economic programme on things other than agriculture was at first Marxian. He introduced straightaway large-scale schemes of nationalization of industries, banking etc but with no efficient men to run them. Then he introduced his new economic policy that is a mixed economy, with a return to 'petty capitalism' or small scale, but nationwide private enterprise under which the country began to recover. He admitted this was only a temporary retreat from Marxism. Lenin had the idea of introducing collectivization but unfortunately died before he could attempt it.

Lenin admitted that during the Dictatorship of the Proletariat the state would wither away, in the sense that even the state power used by the Proletariat as an instrument of class oppression would wither away. Lenin also believed in the classless communist society, whose motto is 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.' However, "Lenin, like Marx retained the moral propulsion of a Utopian ideal, but he did not confuse the ideal with the attainable".

9.15 Internationalism and world Revolution

Lenin was an internationalist to the core. It is very difficult to find in his writings any trace of national bias. Lenin had no ambition of territorial aggrandizement. Of course he thought that Russia would be lucky if she maintained her existing territory.

Lenin was convinced that capitalism and socialism could never co exist. So, for the success of Russian revolution there must be some more revolutions all over Europe and the World. So Lenin founded the Third International in March 1919 to organize a world Revolution.

9.16 Summary:

1. The Communist parties in different countries must try to seize the government. Hence in countries where they are forbidden they stealthily infiltrate into the different departments of government and elsewhere they should, according to expediency, set up their own candidates for election to the legislatures or local governments or support the candidates or other Leftist parties and should never be afraid of making compromises with other parties, just to break them afterwards:

2. They should take up the cause of the natives of the European Colonies, help them to get political independence and them to seize the government.
3. In the productive field, they should form the Trade unions. Elect their bodies of the workers; finally they must assume leadership of all the bodies.
4. They should make use of the existing army, rifle clubs for giving to the workers military training. This will make them to stand in good stead in the future revolutionary battles.
5. They should create organizations, bearing non-communist names in order to promote some aspect of communist policy.

Lenin added new meaning and content to Marxism and his impact is felt in all revolutionary events wherever communism has away. China is a notable example.

9.17 Key words:

Revolutionary, Communist, Manifesto dialectical materialism, Makeridistic interpretation, Have, Have not, dictatorship proletariat, capitalist, democracy.

Assassinated, Capitalism, Materialism, exploitation, Germany, Centralized Revolution ,

9.18 Answers for CYP Question :

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 7.5

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 7.9

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 7.10

Question No.4 – Refer Paragraph No. 7.12

Question No.5 - Refer Paragraph No. 7.13

Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 9.2

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 9.4

Question No.3 – Refer Paragraph No. 9.6

9.19 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, Londonm Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
- 4.D.Gemino. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chieage, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medicval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

9.20 Model Question

- 1.Evaluate Lenin's political ideas.

- 2.Examine the views of Karl Marx on class struggle**
- 3.Analyze Karl Marx's view on dialectic materialism**
- 4.Make an evaluation of Kari Marx's contribution to political thought.**

Unit – 10

MAO-TSE-TUNG (1893 – 1976)

Introduction

Maoism is a word coined by Harvard scholars, to describe the theory and practice of revolutions by Mao Tee Tung. Maoism is unique for its revision, and improvement of the various aspects of communist doctrine and also Soviet practice. Before 1911 Mao's political views were primarily those set forth by the western influenced Neo-Confucian reformers. During this period Mao studied the concept of socialism, the works and writings of Darwin, Mill Rousseau and Spencer.

Objectives:

- To understand the Mao's view of stalin.
- To explain the Mao's Domestic Programmes.
- To study the concept of Mao's foreign policy.

Unit Structure

- Mao's Life History
- Mao a Philosopher
- Mao's view of Stalin
- Mao's Domestic Programmes
- Mao's foreign policy
- Summary
- Key words
- Answers for CYP Question
- Books for further Reading
- Model Question

10.1 Mao's Life History

Mao was born in the year 1893. In his childhood days, he saw in his village unrest because of flood, droughts, famine and misrule. Even though his father was the supporter of mandarin. Mao took sides with peasants. The difference and quarrel between the son and father made Mao to leave the house in 1911. After joining a high school, he got involved in the revolution and enlisted in the army, which overthrew the Manchus. In 1912 he left the army. Mao could not get a job for a year. During this period, he read widely western political and economic thought. He was very much against the dictatorship of Quan sha-kai. He gathered a group of man around him and established a revolutionary club, the New Citizens society.

After college, Mao became an assistant in the University Library in Peking. Here he studied about Karl Marx. Mao was attracted by 'Class Struggle; view of Marx. Mao thought that it would free the workers and peasants. Again he returned to Changsha to work as a teacher. Here he participated in the 'May Fourth Movement'. This was a protest against the Japanese seizure of Shantung and the misrule of the warlords. By 1920, he thought violent demonstrations were very must necessary in the place of just demonstrations and protests. Mao analyzed Marxism more and more and adopted revolutionary methods. In 1921, the first Congress of the Chinese Communist was held. In the year 1922, Chinese Communist Party joined with Sun Yat-Sen's party, the kuomintang. In 1925 Sun Yat-sen died. Mao moved to work in the propaganda department of the Kuomintang. Mao along with Chou En-lai wished to overthrow

landlords and set up peasant communes. In retaliation Chiang demanded that the Kuomintang should expel all communists. In Shanghai, the offices of the party were attacked and burned. Communists were arrested, imprisoned and shot. Trade union leaders and government officers were forced to swear allegiance to Kuomintang. Mao escaped the killing. Mao said Chiang Kai-shek must be sacrificed and the peasants take over the revolution from the wealthy generals. Marx and Lenin felt that urban workers would lead the Revolution. Mao felt that 99% of Chinese populations were peasants so the communism in China must be based on peasants.

Mao collected 10,000 men and formed his first 'soviet'. The Kiangsi-Human Republic agents were sent to the major cities for the purpose of preaching communism. Between 1931 and 1934 Chiang sent his armies several times to encircle the communists but he failed in his attempts. But in 1934 the Communist leaders decided to evacuate Kiangsi Human Agents to save them from annihilation. Mao made the countryside as the denture for communist revolution. He created a self-sustaining rural base and started a national revolution with guerilla army. Mao developed a doctrine of war. 'the enemy advance, we retreat, the enemy camps, we harass, the enemy tires, we attack, the enemy retreats, we pursue'. By 1931 Mao used the principle of luring the enemy in deep was put forward and successfully applied. By 1931 a complete set of operational principle for the Red Army had taken shape.

Mao's code was his stress on the long war. Mao rejected the modern western and society military doctrine of quick decision war.

Mao aimed at organization and control of the people and also the control of the economic resources of the area, where war is being waged; capitalists and political appointments must be eliminated. This organization of resistance of Mao was successful because of Japanese aggression. Mao was able to exploit the patriotic sentiments for domestic revolution. These Maoist features are not found in Soviet Russia. In China their impact is seen in the army, in the party, in the university and in everywhere.

Nearly for four years the office of Mao was in a cave or a ruined hut. After so much of hardship Mao and his red soldier reached Shensi, where Mao set up a new state. Shensi Soviet was the headquarters of Chinese communist party until the revolution of 1948-49. By 1949, Mao was successful in driving away kuomintang forces to Formosa. From 1950, till his death in 1976 he put his political thoughts into action. He became the unquestioned leader of the Chinese people.

10.2 Mao a Philosopher

Mao was as glorious as a political organizer and guerilla leader. At the same time he was a philosopher genius. His works 'on practice' and 'on contradiction' were logically very clear. In 1957 Mao said that certain contradictions do exist between the leader and the led. This was unprecedented in Communist literature. Mao emphasized that knowledge is primarily a generalization from practice and only secondarily a reflection of personal insight. Mao says that

the Man's correct idea can come only from social practice that too from production struggle, class struggle and scientific experiment.

10.3 Mao's view of Stalin

In the earlier years of his career as a communist Mao followed only certain portions of the programme that Stalin endorsed for china. Even though Mao was aware of the blunders of Stalin, he did not criticize, but he criticized Trotsky and also the Chinese leaders who slavishly followed Stalin. Mao said Stalin's merits were greater than his faults. Of course Mao was critical of certain aspects of Stalin's leadership. For example, the liquidation of thousands of communists was not accepted. Mao said he was incapable of such brutality. He felt that his personal modesty prevented him.

Mao compared Stalin to a great but imperfect eagle.

Stalin imposed total control on Russia. During the Czarist regime a number of social and political institutions were in existence, Stalin destroyed all. Like that Mao transformed the Chinese communist party into an instrument of power. He enforced discipline. Thinkers say that Mao went further than Stalin.

Mao took from Stalin the concept of long-term and high-speed industrialization by shock brigade effort. Mao adopted socialist labour. Further Mao adopted the method of forced labour camps.

10.4 Mao's Domestic Programmes

By 1949 there was close relation between the Army and the Chinese communist party in China. These helped Mao to stop opposition to his policies, and the traditional institutions were destroyed. Mao's agrarian reform consolidated his control over the

**CYP
Question**
1. Explain
the Mao's
views on
Stalin

**CYP
Question**
2.
Explain
the
domestic
program
mes of
Mao's

countryside. The masses for class war. This was organized against smallest merchants who were compelled to spend all their savings. This actually led to the several thousands in shanghai to commit suicide and some escaped from the place. This changed the private industry and commerce. The last campaign was against the corrupt members of the communist party. Large number of party men were expelled and some of the were sent to the concentration camps.

The drive against the counter revolutionaries helped the abolition of all bourgeoisie concepts of legal protection. Of course adhoc people's courts were created. All private owned means of production were converted into joint enterprises. The administration of these went into the hands of party officials.

The Maoists rejected the thesis of peaceful co-existence. Even the Soviet Economic programme was rejected, by the year 1958.

The programmes of Mao's took a great leap forward and the people's commune of 1958-59 were implemented. Marxist principle was adopted that is to each according to his needs. But the communes took over all private plots, orchards, and also the domestic animals. Wage supply system was arranged; apart from wages, free staples like rice and wheat were supplied.

Mao's plan was to increase production and reduce the consumption. Large labour armies would make it possible to shift labour from on industry to another and from agriculture to industry. Mao wanted communal mess halls, which he thought would reduce the waste of time in the preparation and eating of meals. Mao

demanded more from men, than they could give him. These arrangements penalized producers and their interest. The farmer has lost his interest to produce more. The loss of all private property degraded the status of peasants. So Mao's policy diverged from tradition. It was totally against the western concept of liberalism.

Because of this failure, Mao retreated in 1959 to 1960. Both economic dislocation and physical deprivation emerged. But through out the retreat Chinese leaders refused to change the policy. But rather it was reaffirmed. The party's central secretariat was strengthened and tightened. They wanted to eliminate opposition to future economic programmes.

Analyzing its effect, the yough cadre were subject to purification. Individual freedom was totally rejected by Mao. Mao wanted the nation to remain revolutionary and incorruptible. Mao demanded that artist and writers should live among the peasants. The Cultural Revolution' of Mao was the struggle against elites, intellectuals the experts and the peasants. Mao wanted the artists also to serve the people.

Mao used rural strategy to spread communism. The rural strategy, which was adopted by Mao, was, a revolution led by poor peasants, a base in the inaccessible countryside and the advocacy of guerilla warfare. This rural strategy is an extension of doctrine of imperialism, Mao advocated gradual control of the countryside by attacking capitalist citadels. Mao felt that by using guerrilla warfare,

the armed forces lived and mingled with people. The basic teachings of Marx and Lenin were adopted for rural strategy.

Because of extreme backwardness of the state, China could not immediately moved into a socialist phase. Mao felt that it would be necessary to retain the technical skills and the general support of many classes in order to develop the industrial base necessary for the march to communism. Mao made a difference between national bourgeois and international bourgeois.

With regard to dialectical materialism Mao is said to have made genuine theoretical break-through Mao said that the different classes in the society would join together to oppose to imperialism. In pursuance of goal, there will be conflict among the group. Mao feels that basically antagonistic nature of class conflict, this type of conflict can only be resolved through complete victory of the Proletariat. Of course there are other types of conflicts which are not antagonistic and which may be peacefully resolved. Mao believed that the contradictions are necessary because it would produce a series of qualitative changes in the society, for the obvious reason that the tension of the conflict would produce a synthesis which was better than which preceded it. Thus a socialist society would be in a state of permanent revolution with the result of their contradiction. Mao said that strong party leadership was necessary to achieve the goals of socialist state.

10.5 Mao's foreign policy

Mao's opposed the policy of USA. He never believed in Peking – Washington compromise. Mao's strategy was to compel the U.S., withdrawal from the Taiwan Strait. He tried there twice in 1954 and 1958; unfortunately he failed to achieve it. Mao's concept was to drive away imperialism from Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Mao had belief in the efficiency of the armed struggle. It became the basic law of revolution. The universal law of class struggle is state power; independence, freedom and equality can be won by armed force alone and safeguarded by armed press alone. Emphasis on small war is also intended to increase Mao's prestige as the guerrilla leader.

10.6 Summary :

Like Lenin Mao stressed a world revolution but unlike Lenin his stress is almost entirely in under developed areas. At the same time like Stalin, Mao laid emphasis on national interests.

Mao differed from Russians in some respects. Mao felt that he and his party must have equal voice, particularly in devising strategy for the communist block. But Mao did not challenge Stalin's leadership of the world communist movement.

10.7 Key words:

Class Struggle, China Slavishly, Industrialism, Liberalism, Cultural Revolution, Universal law.

10.8 Answers for CYP Question :

For Question No.1 – Refer Paragraph No. 10.3

Question No.2 – Refer Paragraph No. 10.4

10.9 Books for further Reading :

1. R.N. Berki. The History of Political Thought. A Short Introduction, London. Dent, 1977.
2. J. Coleman. A History of Political Thought: From Ancient Greece to Early Christianity, Londonm Blackwell. 2000
3. W. Ebenstein, Great Political Thinkers, New Delhi, Oxford & IBH, 1969.
- 4.D.Gemino. Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx, Chieage, University of Chicago Press 1972.
5. C.H. Mellwain. The Growth of Political Thought in the West, New York, Macmillan, 1932.
6. J.B. Morall. Political Thought in Medicval Times, New York, Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
7. G.H. Sabine. History of Political Theory. 4th edn, revised by T.L. Thorson, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH. 1973.
8. Q. Skinner. The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, 2 Volumes, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 1990.

10.10 Model Question

1. Discuss Mao's political ideas.
2. Examine the Mao's contribution to political thoughts

Model Questions - I

Time : Three hours

Maximum : 100 marks

Answer any FIVE questions

All questions carry equal marks.

1. Discuss Communism of wives and Communism of Property to enunciated by Plato.
2. Examine Aristotle's views on slavery.
3. Bring out Machiavelli's advices to the Prince.
4. Discuss Hobbe's concept of sovereignty.
5. Examine Locke's views on private property.
6. Explain Rousseau's understanding of human nature..
7. Examine the ideas of Mill on Representative Government.
8. Bring out Marx's arguments in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat.
9. Discuss Lenin's views on imperialism.
10. Examine Mao's concept of revolution.

Model Questions - II

Time : Three hours

Maximum : 100 marks

Answer any FIVE questions

All questions carry equal marks.

1. Examine the significance of Plato's concept of Education.
2. How do the ideal states of Plato and Aristotle.
3. Discuss Hobbe's ideas of social contract.
4. Examine the views of J.S. Mill on Representative government and estimate their validity today.
5. Write an essay on Hegel's Political Thought.
6. Give a brief description about St. Thomas Aquinas's theory of Law and Justice.
7. Examine Laski's views about private property.
8. Discuss the concept of Marx's theory of class war.
9. Examine the economic ideas of Gandhi.
10. Discuss the Jawaharlal Nehru's contribution to international relations.

